1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO.	, INC.
2	RPTS HASSETT	
3	HIF173030	
4		
5		
6	MARKUP ON:	
7	H.R, HYDROPO	WER POLICY MODERNIZATION
8	ACT OF 2017; H.R	, ENHANCING STATE
9	ENERGY SECURITY PLA	NNING AND EMERGENCY
10	PREPAREDNESS ACT; H	I.R. 2786, TO AMEND THE
11	FEDERAL POWER ACT W	ITH RESPECT TO THE
12	CRITERIA AND PROCES	S TO QUALIFY A
13	QUALIFYING CONDUIT	HYDROPOWER FACILITY;
14	H.R. 2883, PROMOTIN	IG CROSS-BORDER ENERGY
15	INFRASTRUCTURE ACT;	AND H.R. 2910,
16	PROMOTING INTERACEN	ICY COORDINATION OF
17	NATURAL GAS PIPELIN	IES ACT
18	THURSDAY, JUNE 22,	2017
19	House of Representa	tives
20	Subcommittee on Ene	rgy
21	Committee on Energy	and Commerce
22	Washington, D.C.	
23		

24	
25	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m.,
26	in Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Fred Upton
27	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
28	Members present: Representatives Upton, Olson, Barton,
29	Shimkus, Murphy, Latta, Harper, McKinley, Kinzinger,
30	Griffith, Johnson, Bucshon, Flores, Mullin, Hudson, Cramer,
31	Walberg, Walden (ex officio), Rush, McNerney, Peters, Green,
32	Doyle, Castor, Sarbanes, Welch, Tonko, Loebsack, Schrader,
33	Kennedy, Butterfield, and Pallone (ex officio).
34	Staff present: Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director;
35	Elena Brennan, Legislative Clerk, Energy/Environment; Karen
36	Christian, General Counsel; Jordan Davis, Director of Policy
37	and External Affairs; Wyatt Ellertson, Research Associate,
38	Energy/Environment; Adam Fromm, Director of Outreach and
39	Coalitions; Giulia Giannangeli, Legislative Clerk, Digital
40	Commerce and Consumer Protection/Communications and
41	Technology; Jay Gulshen, Legislative Clerk, Health; Tom
42	Hassenboehler, Chief Counsel, Energy/Environment; A.T.
43	Johnston, Senior Policy Advisor, Energy; Ben Lieberman,
44	Senior Counsel, Energy; Mary Martin, Deputy Chief Counsel,
45	Energy & Environment; Katie McKeough, Press Assistant; Carly

McWilliams, Professional Staff Member, Health; Brandon

47	Mooney, Deputy Chief Energy Advisor; Mark Ratner, Policy
48	Coordinator; Annelise Rickert, Counsel, Energy; Dan
49	Schneider, Press Secretary; Sam Spector, Policy Coordinator,
50	Oversight and Investigations; Jason Stanek, Senior Counsel,
51	Energy; Madeline Vey, Policy Coordinator, Digital Commerce
52	and Consumer Protection; Hamlin Wade, Special Advisor,
53	External Affairs; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director;
54	David Cwiertny, Minority Energy/Environment Fellow; Elizabeth
55	Ertel, Minority office Manager; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy
56	and Environment Policy Advisor; Evan Gilbert, Minority Press
57	Assistant; Caitlin Haberman, Minority Professional Staff
58	Member; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor and Staff
59	Director, Energy and Environment; John Marshall, Minority
60	Policy Coordinator; Dan Miller, Minority Policy Analyst;
61	Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst; Tim Robinson,
62	Minority Chief Counsel; Andrew Souvall, Minority Director of
63	Communications, outreach and Member Services; Tuley Wright,
64	Minority Energy and Environment Policy Advisor; and C.J.
65	Young, Minority Press Secretary.

66	The Chairman. (Good morning, everybody.
67	This markup is o	going to include five important energy
68	infrastructure-relate	ed bills dealing with hydropower,
69	pipelines, electric t	ransmission, and grid security. Some of
70	the bills have been o	drafted with bipartisan input, while some
71	are still a little bi	t of a work in progress, and in large
72	part we are picking u	up where we left off on last year's
73	energy bill conference	ce.
74	We have legislat	tion introduced by Mr. Hudson and Ms.
75	DeGette to promote sm	nall conduct hydropower, a bill
76	introduced by Mr. Mul	lin promoting cross-border energy
77	infrastructure, a bil	l introduced by Mr. Flores promoting
78	interagency coordinat	tion for review of the natural gas
79	pipelines, and a disc	cussion draft sponsored by Mrs. Cathy
80	McMorris Rodgers to m	nodernize the licensing process for
81	hydropower projects.	
82	We are also taki	ng up a new discussion draft that I am
83	leading to enhance st	ate energy security planning and
84	emergency preparednes	ss.
85	This bipartisan	discussion draft builds upon the
86	committee's impressiv	ve record of addressing energy security,
87	emergency preparednes	ss, job creation, and infrastructure
88	protection.	

89	Through the FA	ST Act, which we passed in 2015, we made
90	several policy upda	tes to reflect evolving cybersecurity
91	threats to the Nati	on's energy and electricity systems,
92	including greater [OOE authority to respond to emergencies.
93	The Enhancing State	Energy Security Planning and Emergency
94	Preparedness Act im	proves the energy emergency planning
95	function establishe	d under a 1990 amendment to the Energy
96	Policy and Conserva	tion Act.
97	Privatizing an	d elevating energy security planning and
98	emergency preparedr	ess is an important and timely step in the
99	face of increased r	risks and interdependence of energy
100	infrastructure and	end use systems.
101	So I look forw	vard to continuing to work across the aisle
102	as we move forward	in finalizing this important bill.
103	Today's subcommitte	e markup is an important step forward as
104	we try to modernize	our Nation's infrastructure and breaking
105	down barriers to jo	b growth and economic development.
106	The discussion	draft, again, remains a work in progress.
107	I look forward to e	ngaging with each member of the
108	subcommittee and fu	all committee to further perfect the bills
109	before it would get	to the floor, so that we can build
110	momentum to get thi	s thing done.
111	And with that,	I yield to my friend, the ranking member

112	of the subcommittee, the gentleman from the Chicago Cubs
113	World Series champion state, Mr. Rush. Though he is probably
114	a White Sox fan because he has got
115	Mr. Rush. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I enjoy as a
116	politician, I am a fan of the Sox and the Cubs.
117	Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for having this
118	markup. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to alert the other side
119	that we come here, we come and we are negotiating on in
120	good faith on some of these bills. But there is hope on our
121	side that for at least some of the bills that we will be
122	marking up today that we will come to an agreement.
123	Specifically, Mr. Chairman, many members of our side
124	have a strong desire to find common ground on hydropower
125	licenses, and committee staff on both sides have been meeting
126	in good faith over the past few weeks to try and reach common
127	ground.
128	Unfortunately, it appears that at least two of the bills
129	that were noticed for today's markup promoting interagency
130	coordination for review of the Natural Gas Pipeline Act and
131	the Hydropower Policy Modernization Act of 2017 are vastly
132	different from the discussion drafts that have been part of
133	the staff negotiation.
134	In fact, Mr Chairman, these two bills do not at all

reflect any of the changes that our side had asked for, but
instead move in the opposite direction and are even more
problematic for our side to accept. Additionally, while we
need to hear from both staff on some of the bills before us
today, I would point out that we never received a response
from you, Mr. Chairman, on our request for a hearing on the
hydroelectric licensing modernization bill with officials
from the Departments of Interior, Commerce, and Agriculture,
whose purview will be greatly impacted by this bill, along
with states and tribes.

This is yet another instance where, once again, Mr.

Chairman, our side is left to wonder whether we will ever hear directly from the administration on any bill or topic in our jurisdiction. In a word, Mr. Chairman, where is the Administrator of the EPA, and where is the Secretary of Energy? Six months into the Trump administration, and we haven't heard a murmur from any -- from the administrator or from the secretary, and it is high time that we hear something from those in the administration who have responsibilities to this subcommittee and to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that we can get through today's markup, that we can go back to good faith negotiations, and find common ground on some of these pieces

158	of legislation wi	thout either side going going in our
159	corner and go in	o our competing and partisan roll calls.
160	With that,	yield back.
161	The Chairman	. The gentleman yields back. The chair
162	would recognize t	he chair of the full committee, the
163	gentleman from Or	egon, Mr. Walden.
164	Mr. Walden.	I thank the gentleman for his leadership on
165	this, on these is	sues. And I know you have been hard at
166	work, heading us	towards solutions that seek to modernize our
167	Nation's energy	nfrastructure and improve our energy
168	security. To dat	e, we have held more than 10 infrastructure-
169	related hearings	and briefings, and just last week the House
170	cleared 10 commit	tee bills to boost our energy infrastructure
171	and increase ener	gy efficiency.
172	This congres	s, we have examined the roadblocks to energy
173	infrastructure an	d barriers to the gas pipeline permitting
174	process, cross-bo	rder energy infrastructure, and hydropower
175	facilities. Our	previous work examining these issues has
176	informed the bill	s under consideration today. We have
177	learned that ofte	ntimes dozens of agencies are involved in
178	the permitting pr	ocess, so it is time that we address these
179	issues head on an	d improve the federal licensing procedures
180	and processes to	ensure that we get these projects to market

sooner for consumers.

Doing this would create good-paying construction jobs and capitalize on America's growing energy potential. These bills would strengthen the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's role as the lead agency for coordinating the necessary environmental reviews and required permits, effectively streamlining the approval process to cut down unnecessary delays and challenges.

I would also like to take note that hydropower is of particular importance to me. In my own State of Oregon, more than 40 percent of our energy is produced from hydropower at relatively low cost to consumers across the district.

Recently, last weekend, I toured the Dalles Dam in Wasco County -- half of it is at least -- and saw firsthand the technology and the generating of clean hydropower for the Pacific Northwest. It is essential as part of our power mix.

We have a great opportunity in this committee to help increase the use of our Nation's hydro resources to better utilize this renewable energy source. The two bills before us today make meaningful improvements to the hydropower licensing process, modernizing our federal policies, and promoting this renewable energy source to ensure consumers across the country receive affordable and reliable

204	electricity from hydropower, which, by the way, emits no
205	greenhouse gas emissions.
206	Pipeline and hydropower bills are not the only bills
207	under consideration today. New vulnerabilities and threats
208	to our Nation's energy infrastructure, and changes in the
209	ways we generate, transmit, and deliver power continue to
210	evolve. States are now at the forefront of energy security
211	and emergency preparedness.
212	The Enhancing State Energy Security Planning and
213	Emergency Preparedness Act would reauthorize and help us to
214	focus a DOE State Energy Program to strengthen state's
215	capabilities to ensure our energy infrastructure is protected
216	against physical and cybersecurity attacks.
217	Cumulatively, these bills represent a really important
218	step forward in our efforts to put consumers first while
219	working to enact reforms that build on our energy abundance,
220	modernize our energy infrastructure, grow our economy, and
221	create good jobs
222	So I thank my colleagues for their work on these bills,
223	and I look forward to continuing our bipartisan efforts as we
224	move toward full committee markup. And I yield back.
225	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. The chair
226	would recognize the ranking member of the full committee, the

gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Pallone, for 3 minutes.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When it comes to energy policy, we have had a good working relationship. It has been honest and constructive, even when our policy differences have led us to go our separate ways.

But today, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the process that the majority has used for this markup. For the past few weeks, our staff have been negotiating with yours in good faith on hydroelectric license reform. We were encouraged by what we saw as your willingness to move legislative language that was, while not acceptable to my caucus, a very significant step closer to reforms that could speed the licensing process without sacrificing environmental protections or state and tribal rights.

Those negotiations seem to be moving forward in a productive manner, and we were willing to allow your legislative draft from the May 3 hearing move forward without amendment or recorded vote, and we may still be willing to do that. However, the draft released on Tuesday night not only failed to address any of the concerns we raised, but actually went so far as to add new sections taken directly from provisions of last year's Senate energy bill that we had explicitly rejected. And this does not bode well for making

this a bipartisan process.

The chairman also insisted on marking up legislation on state energy security plans that our members first saw

Tuesday night and that has never been the subject of a legislative hearing or member level discussion of any kind. And this is not bad legislation, but we are marking it up today without any formal feedback from members of this committee or stakeholders.

And then there is H.R. 2910, the natural gas pipeline permit streamlining bill, which is a completely new and different bill than the one that was discussed at our legislative hearing last month. And it is clear from the text provided with the markup notice dated June 14 that you had this language for almost a full week before sharing it with us.

Now I guess I am really talking about regular order here for the most part, Mr. Chairman. I know that you and the chairman of the full committee always talk about regular order, but we have to follow regular order, and that is not what was done today. We want to work with you where we can, but that relationship, whether we are collaborating on bills or contesting legislation on which we disagree, requires a level of trust. And if we are to have that trust and be

273	productive, this is not the way we should be doing business.
274	And I wanted to speak to the individual bills as they
275	come up, but I hope that today's issues represent an
276	aberration and not a new and unfortunate way of doing
277	business. Again, you know I am a stickler for regular order,
278	and that is really what I am talking about here today, Mr.
279	Chairman.
280	I yield back.
281	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
282	within to make an opening statement? The gentleman from
283	Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.
284	Mr. Olson. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I will be
285	very brief. First, I am glad we are taking a look at state
286	energy security planning. We had a tropical storm come
287	across the Gulf of Mexico yesterday, come ashore at Sabine
288	Pass, Tropical Storm Cindy. She was deadly. A 10-year-old
289	boy was killed by debris in Alabama. And while keeping
290	people safe is our first priority, we can't ignore that
291	energy supply failures can cause death and destruction, too.
292	Tropical Storm Cindy hit America's first LNG export
293	plant, Sabine Pass on the Texas-Louisiana border, run by
294	Cheniere. Some offshore rigs in the Gulf were shut down,
	II .

of those actions may cause prices to increase

evacuated.

All

296	at home. These threats are real. And as cyber threats
297	evolve, we need to be ready for that as well. Let's get this
298	right.
299	I am also glad we are tackling hydropower reforms.
300	Texas isn't famous for its hydropower, but it is an important
301	clean baseload power. We should be making it easier to build
302	these sources of energy.
303	Lastly, on pipelines, we need these reforms. We have
304	seen time and time and time again that the current process
305	takes too long and is way too messy. The better we do on
306	getting the energy infrastructure built, the better our
307	economy is. We need to examine these projects, hear all
308	sides, and then make a decision. Death by review doesn't
309	help anyone.
310	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.
311	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
312	wishing to speak? The gentleman from Texas is recognized for
313	2 minutes for an opening statement.
314	Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for
315	calling up these bills. I am pleased that we are marking up
316	my bill, H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy
317	Infrastructure Act.
318	The presidential permitting process dates back for many

319	administrations, but Congress has the duty to regulate the
320	commerce of the United States and cross-border energy
321	infrastructure projects far well within that space.
322	Opponents of this bill will argue that the executive
323	permitting process has worked well in the past. It is true
324	that in the past the process has been proven effective.
325	Unfortunately, cross-border decisions have now fallen
326	victim to election cycle politics. We cannot build
327	infrastructure in our country, on this continent, based on
328	who sits in the White House, a Democrat or a Republican. The
329	amendment would create a regulatory process in Department of
330	State, Department of Energy, Federal Regulatory Commission,
331	to permit cross-border infrastructure.
332	This is no different than building roads or bridges or
333	railroads. Department of Transportation coordinates that
334	and, in this case, we will see the coordination for pipes and
335	wires. We need to build electricity transmission lines and
336	pipelines to move resources from where they are to where they
337	are needed.
338	The bill complies with the National Environmental Policy
339	Act and requires a full environmental review of any cross-
340	border facility, including an analysis of climate change
341	impacts. The entire length of the pipeline or electric

342	transmission will	be reviewed for environmental impacts, not
343	just a cross-bord	er section.
344	We should em	brace the changes taking place in North
345	America, harmoniz	e our policies with those of our neighbors
346	in the north and	south, and that is why this bill is
347	important.	
348	I do have so	me concerns about H.R. 2910. Limiting
349	input, when it co	mes to NEPA reviews, is not the right route
350	forward, and I am	concerned that the legislation will create
351	new federal terms	that will lead to confusion about review
352	types undertaken	by federal agencies.
353	Modernizatio	n of Hydro Act, as I am proud to support, I
354	support H.R. 2786	, promoting small conduit and hydropower. I
355	am also happy to	see the subcommittee is also addressing
356	state energy secu	rity plans. These are vital to coastal
357	states and lik	e Texas, for protection against national
358	disasters. I am	happy to see the program reauthorized.
359	And I yield	back my time.
360	The Chairman	. The gentleman yields back. Other members
361	wishing to give a	n opening statement on the Republican side?
362	Seeing none, Mr.	McNerney is recognized for 2 minutes.
363	Mr. McNerney	. I thank the chairman. We are considering
364	some important bi	lls here today on hydropower, fossil fuel,

energy infrastructure, and issues related to protection of
our energy and electrical assets.
It is very important to modernize electrical our
energy infrastructure, and I strongly support efforts to do
that. This includes hydropower, wind, solar, as well as oil
and gas. All of these issues need the attention of this
subcommittee and of the full Energy and Commerce Committee.
The bills before us today are an attempt to address those
issues.
However, I do believe we need to work on a bipartisan
basis, and I say this in real concern for my Republican
colleagues. We have learned on this side of the aisle
through painful experience that any bills that are pushed
through without significant bipartisan work and compromise
are not sustainable and will cause significant political
pain. Learn from our experience. Work with us to improve
these bills.
I yield back.
The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
wishing to speak? The gentlelady from Florida, Ms. Castor,
is recognized.
Ms. Castor. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman,
and good morning. These are very important energy policy

388	matters we will consider today, but the way we this
389	committee has arrived at the markup is very troubling. And
390	it is not up to the high standards of this committee, one of
391	the most important in the Congress, that has such a far-
392	reaching impact on the lives of the folks that we represent.
393	It has become too common for the majority party to be
394	operating in secret. Most of these bills have not received a
395	legislative hearing, and that just doesn't impact us, it
396	impacts the ability of the public to have to make any
397	comment on legislation that is moving through the Congress.
398	And I am afraid it has become all too common in this
399	Congress, and bad process leads to bad policy. And I believe
400	it is diminishing the stature of this committee to operate in
401	that manner.
402	And I think Mr. Rush also raises a very important point.
403	Here we are at the end of June, and this it may be the
404	first time that this committee has not had any hearing with
405	the Energy Secretary, the EPA Administrator; on the health
406	side, the HHS Secretary, and I think that is a real problem
407	for the ability of the Congress to function. I don't know if
408	it is a problem with governing or if it is an intentional
409	attempt to just hide the ball from the American people.
410	So we will have we will bring amendments and

411	important debate today, but until you improve the process you
412	are not going to be able to improve the policy for the folks
413	we represent.
414	I yield back.
415	The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back. Any members
416	Mr. Tonko?
417	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. While I have
418	substantive concerns with the Hydropower Policy Modernization
419	Act, and the Pipeline Interagency Coordination Act, I also
420	want to express some concerns with the process that got us
421	here. Many members of this subcommittee requested additional
422	hearings on hydropower in order to hear from state and tribal
423	governments and resource agencies. That request was not
424	granted.
425	I do not believe we have a full sense of the steps that
426	should be taken to streamline and improve the hydro licensing
427	process without undermining the interests of a number of
428	stakeholders in the process. When we have received testimony
429	from key witnesses, it hasn't always been heated. FERC has
430	said it does not support the changes to trial-type hearings
431	included in the bill before us today.
432	Finally, after last week's tragic events, our hearing
433	examining energy assurance plans was rightfully postponed.

434	It has not been rescheduled, and it was not a legislative
435	hearing to begin within. Now we are marking up a discussion
436	draft today.
437	Now, generally speaking, I think this is a pretty good
438	draft that I would be happy to support if we can get the
439	authorization level right. But, again, the process was not
440	ideal.
441	The State Energy Program is critically important. I saw
442	this firsthand while leading the New York State Energy
443	Research and Development Authority, and I am happy to see the
444	draft before us today to reauthorize the program. I have
445	introduced legis ation to reauthorize the program for a
446	number of years, and I would encourage the committee to
447	support an authorization level of \$90 million, which is equal
448	to what passed the Senate as part of last year's
449	comprehensive energy bill.
450	It is also a \$35 million decrease from the previous
451	authorization level. With evolving threats to energy
452	systems, states are needing to do more than ever before to
453	ensure the reliability, the resiliency, and the security of
454	their systems. We cannot ask them to do more with less.
455	And I thank the chair for recognizing the value of SEP
456	and for holding today's markup. And with that, I yield back

457	the remaining bit of my time.
458	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
459	wishing to speak, give an opening statement? Seeing none,
460	the chair will call up the Hydropower Policy Modernization
461	Act of 2017 and ask the clerk to report.
462	[The bill follows:]
463	**************************************

464	Ms. Giannangeli. A discussion draft to modernize
465	hydropower policy and for other purposes.
466	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of
467	the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for
468	amendment at any point. So ordered.
469	Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Seeing
470	none, are there - oh, I am sorry, we have the chair would
471	recognize strike the last word the gentleman from
472	Oregon.
473	Mr. Walden. I thank the gentleman. I move to strike
474	the last word. The Hydropower Policy Modernization Act
475	discussion draft led by our colleague, Mrs. McMorris Rodgers
476	of Washington State, is a really good faith effort to improve
477	the licensing process for hydropower, which is an important
478	part of our renewable energy system.
479	Hydropower is a clean, renewable, and reliable source of
480	baseload energy. It provides low-cost electricity to
481	millions of Americans, especially in the northwest,
482	especially in my district, especially in my state, where
483	about half of the Nation's hydropower capacity is located.
484	Hydropower has significant untapped potential. We know
485	that from the hearings we have had and the reports we have
486	seen. Unfortunately, the process to license hydropower has

487 been increasingly complex, leading to unnecessary delays and 488 uncertainty. 489 While FERC serves as the lead agency in hydropower proceedings and sets schedules for those proceedings, there 490 may be multiple federal and state agencies or Indian tribes 491 492 that conduct separate permitting and environmental reviews. In testimony before this committee in May, FERC identified 493 494 dozens of projects where the Federal Energy Regulatory 495 Commission has completed its work on a project and is now stuck waiting for another agency to act under other laws --496 497 Clean Water Act or Endangered Species Act. In several cases, these projects have been stalled for 498 499 more than a decade, 10 years. Congress must act, and we have a wonderful opportunity today to do that. As we have heard 500 from FERC, they have a full workload, and the relicensing 501 502 workload in particular is stated to -- is slated to increase and will continue to remain high well into the 2030s. 503 Between now and then, almost half of our existing hydropower 504 facilities will begin the relicensing process. 505 506 It is our sincere desire to continue to improve this draft -- to improve this draft -- so that we have a strong 507 bipartisan product that we can all be proud of. 508 509 accomplish that, we are committed to working to improve

510	coordination among agencies and bring more accountability and
511	transparency to the process.
512	So I look forward to working with the ranking member,
513	Mr. Pallone, and all interested members of this committee to
514	try to perfect this draft, and our work will continue between
515	this subcommittee's efforts and the full committee.
516	With that, Mr. Chairman, I would yield to my friend from
517	New Jersey, Mr. Pallone.
518	Mr. Pallone Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand
519	that our staffs have had productive conversations over the
520	past week or two on Representative McMorris Rodgers'
521	discussion draft, to reform the hydropower licensing process.
522	We had a setback when the new draft was noticed for this
523	markup because it shifts the goalpost, but we would like to
524	continue to work with you toward a bill that can achieve
525	broad support among all of the members of our committee.
526	If we agree on the goals, a more timely, reliable
527	license process that provides certainty to the license
528	applicants and that continues to respect state authorities
529	and tribal rights and protects natural and cultural
530	resources, we should be able to come to agreement on this
531	bill, but we are not there yet.
532	Our side continues to have concerns with the draft.

There are threshold issues for each of us. We will have to work through these things, of course, but I remain optimistic at this point, and it is certainly worth the effort.

Again, this should not be a partisan issue. Members on both sides have hydropower facilities in their districts and their states, and we want to see them continue to operate and thrive. Renewable baseload power offers many important benefits. And, as I said, we share your goal of having a licensing process that moves along more quickly and avoids license proceedings that drag on for many years beyond the current license expiration.

While happily most licenses move through FERC in a reasonable period of time, we have all heard of cases in which a facility operates for many years on an annual existing license, and that is not good for anyone. It doesn't get the enhanced environmental performance and water management that states, tribes, and local communities are seeking, and it doesn't provide the certainty and stability of a long-time license that the hydropower operator is seeking.

But a speed er license process should not come at the expense of a state's right to manage water, public safety, the public participation, or at the expense of all the other

556	vital economic am	d societal resources and activities that
557	rely on the river	s, water, and surrounding lands. When all
558	parties to the li	cense process work together, everyone
559	benefits.	
560	So I hope wo	rking together we can strike a proper
561	balance among al	of these interests and produce a bill that
562	all of us can sup	port. We still have a lot of work to do,
563	but with goodwill	, a concerted effort, and a willingness to
564	compromise, I am	optimistic we can achieve a good product.
565	And so with	the understanding that we will continue
566	working towards a	comprise bill that we can mark up next
567	week, we will for	ego offering any amendments today and agree
568	to move this bil	forward to the full committee.
569	Thank you, M	r. Chairman.
570	Mr. Walden.	I want to just commend my colleague from
571	New Jersey. We s	hare your goal that we do this without
572	sacrificing our e	nvironmental goals or infringing on state
573	and tribal rights	. All stakeholders should have the
574	opportunity to pa	rticipate in collaborative, transparent
575	public proceeding	s where significant issues are identified
576	and are appropria	tely studied.
577	So I appreci	ate your work with us on this. I know you
578	are committed to	trying to move this forward as well. That

579	we still have mor	e work to do is obvious, and we look forward
580	to getting that w	ork done between now and full committee.
581	So I thank y	ou, and I yield back.
582	The Chairman	. Thank you, both of you. And I was part
583	of a discussion	ast night with Mr. Pallone, and we came to
584	this agreement an	d look forward to working with all parties
585	to get this bill	in proper shape before it goes to full
586	committee.	
587	Are there fu	rther amendments are there any further
588	amendments to the	bill?
589	Mr. Sarbanes	. Mr. Chairman?
590	The Chairman	. The gentleman from Maryland is
591	recognized.	
592	Mr. Sarbanes	. I move to strike the last word. I just
593	wanted to pick up	on the last thing that Congressman Pallone
594	was referring to	And that is, as we move this thing along
595	and make legislat	ive changes relating to the licensing
596	process, the impo	rtance of the state role can't be overstated
597	in terms of prote	cting local water quality.
598	In Maryland,	actually, this is a very bipartisan issue,
599	and our Republica	n Secretary of the Environment sent a letter
600	to House leadersh	ip last year describing how important the
601	state's authority	is to require conditions in FERC licenses

602	that are necessar	y to protect water quality.
603	The Conowing	o Dam in Maryland, a hydroelectric dam, is
604	currently in the	FERC relicensing process. That dam sits on
605	the Susquehanna	iver, which provides half of the fresh water
606	that reaches the	Chesapeake Bay. Both the river and the dam
607	are critical to t	he bay's water quality. So it is essential
608	that Maryland ret	ain the authority to protect the health of
609	the bay and the	pastal economies that depend on the bay by
610	setting the neces	sary water quality conditions for
611	Conowingo's FERC	license.
612	So we do tal	k a lot in this committee, and I think it is
613	appropriate about	the value of the knowledge that comes from
614	local conditions	and local communities, and I would urge my
615	colleagues again	as we proceed not to take water quality
616	decisions out of	the hands of the people who know those local
617	communities and	onditions best and are in the best position
618	to work with the	applicant and local communities to move the
619	license forward.	
620	I would ask	unanimous consent, if I could, Mr. Chairman,
621	to enter this let	ter from Secretary Grumbles from Maryland
622	into the record.	
623	The Chairman	. Without objection.
624	[The informa	tion follows:]
		· ·

29

(202) 234-4433

\sim	0
≺ .	

626	Mr. Sarbanes. Thank you, and I yield back.
627	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Are there
628	amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the question now occurs
629	on forwarding the Hydropower Policy Modernization Act of 2017
630	to the full committee.
631	All those in favor will say aye.
632	Those opposed, say no.
633	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes appear to have it,
634	the ayes have it, and the bill is agreed to.
635	The chair will now call up H.R. 2786 and ask the clerk
636	to report.
637	[The bill follows:]
638	********INSERT 2******

639	Ms. Giannang	eli. H.R. 2786, to amend the Federal Power
640	Act with respect	to the criteria and process to qualify as a
641	qualifying conduc	t hydropower facility.
642	The Chairman	. And without objection, the first reading
643	of the bill is di	spensed with. The bill will be open for
644	amendment at any	point. So ordered.
645	Are there ar	y bipartisan amendments to bill?
646	Mr. Hudson.	Mr. Chairman?
647	The Chairman	. The gentleman from North Carolina, Mr.
648	Hudson.	
649	Mr. Hudson.	If you would allow me to strike the last
650	word.	
651	The Chairman	Strike the last word. The gentleman is
652	recognized for 5	
653	Mr. Hudson.	Thank you. Chairman Upton, Ranking Member
654		or holding today's important markup. I
655	_	bcommittee's consideration of this common-
656		introduced by Representative DeGette and
657	5	tapping our Nation's immense conduit
	_	
658	hydropower potent	
659	Promoting th	is affordable source of clean electricity is
660	important to our	Nation's all-of-the-above energy strategy.
661	Hydropower remain	s one of the most efficient and affordable

sources of electricity as well as one of the largest sources of renewable electricity in America. In North Carolina alone, it generates enough electricity to power 350,000 homes each year.

Despite its benefits, hydropower's growth has been stagnant when compared to other renewable electricity sources in recent years. That lack of progress is not due to lack of opportunity. There are unnecessary regulatory burdens that simply cloq up the dam.

One key example is the overly complicated licensing process for conduit hydropower. This innovative class of hydropower harnesses the power of water flowing through manmade systems such as pipes and municipal water systems or irrigation canals. It produces emissions-free clean energy, improves energy diversity, lowers power bills, and creates jobs, all by making use of energy that would have otherwise been wasted.

For this reason, conduit hydropower is often described as energy recovery hydropower. The opportunity is tremendous. There are over 1.2 million miles of water supply mains in the United States, creating literally thousands of energy recovery hydropower generation opportunities. But Congress must remove some of the regulatory roadblocks that

685	inhibit this market-driven growth. That is exactly what our
686	legislation will do.
687	I would like to again thank Representative DeGette for
688	her collaboration on this bipartisan bill. We have refined
689	our bill after considering the feedback during last month's
690	hearing from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, non-
691	governmental organizations, and the hydropower industry.
692	H.R. 2786 would build on the industry's lessons learned from
693	previous legislative success in 2013, the Hydropower
694	Regulatory Efficiency Act, and reduce the total review
695	process time for small-scale hydropower.
696	It would also remove the capacity cap and allow more
697	qualifying conduit projects to use the streamline process.
698	Reducing the regulatory burdens is a common-sense way to
699	increase our Nation's supply of clean and affordable
700	electricity.
701	Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for including our legislation
702	on today's agenda. I look forward to working with you to
703	advance this initiative through our committee. And with
704	that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
705	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. The chair
706	would recognize the gentleman from New Jersey to strike the
707	last word for 5 minutes, Mr. Pallone.

\sim	1	
~	71	

708	Mr. Pallone Well, actually, Mr. Chairman, I have an
709	amendment, so
710	The Chairman. The gentleman has are there any
711	bipartisan amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the
712	gentleman from New Jersey has offered an amendment. The
713	clerk will report the title of the amendment.
714	[The amendment offered by Mr. Pallone follows:]
715	*******COMMITTEE INSERT 2*****

716	Ms. Giannange	eli. Amendment to H.R. 2786, offered by Mr.
717	Pallone.	
718	The Chairman	. And the amendment will be considered as
719	read. The staff	will distribute the amendment, and the
720	gentleman is recog	gnized for 5 minutes in support of his
721	amendment.	
722	Mr. Pallone.	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Another bill in
723	2013, our committe	ee moved a bipartisan bill that was
724	sponsored by Repre	esentative McMorris Rodgers and
725	Representative Dec	Gette that created an exemption from
726	hydropower licens	ing for certain conduit hydropower
727	facilities of 5 me	egawatts capacity or less.
728	And under the	e process established in that McMorris
729	Rodgers-DeGette b	ill, FERC must determine within 15 days
730	after receipt of	a notice of intent to construct a small
731	conduit project by	y the developer if the project meets the
732	qualifying criter	ia for exemption under the law.
733	If FERC makes	s an initial determination that the project
734	meets that criter	ia, current law requires FERC to publish a
735	public notice of	that determination and provide the public 45
736	days for an opport	tunity to comment on or contest FERC's
737	determination. \$	o that bill previous the previous bill
738	went on to be sign	ned into law by President Obama, and as of

May has resulted in qualifying 83 projects being exempted from federal licensing requirements.

Now, the bill before us today, H.R. 2786, sponsored by Mr. Hudson and Ms. DeGette, would amend the Federal Power Act to lift the 5 megawatt cap on conduit projects that could qualify for exemption, and it also reduces from 45 to 15 days the amount of time the public would have to comment on or contest first determination of whether a project qualifies for exemption.

So I support the development of conduit hydroelectric projects and efforts to cut red tape to ensure that environmentally sound projects can move forward quickly and efficiently. And to that end, I also support language in the bill before us that removes the 5 megawatt cap in current law and the size of conduit hydroprojects that qualify for the exemption.

However, while I am open to modifying the 45-day timeframe for public comment on the proposed exemption, I believe that 15 days is too short a period to allow for meaningful public input into the process, and that is why I am proposing in this amendment a compromise that would reduce the amount of time for public notification by a third, from 45 days to 30 days.

762	The amendment balances the interests of hydropower
763	developers and that of the public. It is my understanding
764	that the chairman intends to accept this amendment I hope
765	that is the case and I would like this bill to go forward
766	with the unanimous support of members on both sides of the
767	aisle, and I believe the amendment I am offering, if adopted,
768	would ensure that outcome.
769	So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues on the other
770	side will adopt the amendment and report the amended bill
771	favorably to the floor.
772	The Chairman. If the gentleman will yield?
773	Mr. Pallone I yield.
774	The Chairman. I would be delighted to accept the
775	amendment. Thank you.
776	Mr. Pallone Thank you, sir.
777	The Chairman. You make a good point, and I would urge
778	my colleagues to support it.
779	Mr. Pallone Thank you, and I yield back.
780	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
781	wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote
782	occurs on the amendment offered by Mr. Pallone.
783	All those in favor will say aye.
784	Those opposed, say no.

785	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The
786	amendment is agreed to.
787	Are there further amendments to the bill? If not, the
788	question now occurs on forwarding H.R. 2786, as amended, to
789	the full committee.
790	All those in favor will say aye.
791	Those opposed, say no.
792	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The
793	bill, as amended, is agreed to.
794	The chair now calls up the Enhancing State Energy
795	Security Planning and Emergency Preparedness Act and asks the
796	clerk to report.
797	[The bill follows:]
798	**************************************

799 Ms. Giannandeli. A discussion draft, to amend the 800 Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide federal 801 financial assistance to states to implement, review, and 802 revise state energy security plans, and for other purposes. 803 The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of 804 the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for any point, and I would ask to strike the last word and recognize 805 806 myself for 5 minutes. 807 The Enhancing State Energy Security Planning and Emergency Preparedness Act would strengthen states' abilities 808 809 to secure our energy infrastructure against physical and 810 cyber attacks, and would help mitigate the risk of energy 811 supply disruptions. States are, in fact, leaders in recognizing the meed to prioritize energy security, emergency 812 preparedness, and energy infrastructure protection. And the 813 814 committee understands that energy security planning is best carried out at the state level. 815 816 No one is more familiar with the circumstances, risks, and vulnerabilities of local areas than the states. And 817 818 throughout the entire process, the committee has worked hard to listen to the needs of the states. The committee received 819 testimony from witnesses, including the National Association 820

of State Energy Officials, the National Association of

822	Regulatory Utility Commissioners, along with several states,
823	including Texas, Washington, Georgia, and, obviously,
824	Michigan.
825	We sincerely appreciate the perspectives that each of
826	these witnesses provided on energy security planning and
827	emergency preparedness. The Department of Energy's State
828	Energy Program was first authorized in the Energy Policy and
829	Conservation Act, EPCA, back in 1975. The initial program
830	provided federal and technical assistance to states who focus
831	their efforts on energy conservation, and a 1990 amendment to
832	EPCA expanded the scope and added energy emergency planning
833	requirements as a supplement to state energy conservation
834	plans.
835	The authorization for the State Energy Program did
836	expire in 2012, and the program has been receiving
837	unauthorized appropriations ever since. Across the Nation,
838	states have to respond to a variety of hazards, including
839	natural disasters such as hurricanes, earthquakes, floods,
840	fuel supply disruptions, physical and cyber threats, and
841	catastrophic events.
842	The current State Energy Program's authorized purpose
843	and scope does not fully address the risks and
844	vulnerabilities of today's evolving energy landscape. It has

845	been 25 years since we properly addressed energy security
846	planning, and it is time for a legislative update.
847	This bipartisan discussion draft reflects our commitment
848	to support states ongoing energy security planning efforts
849	yet still affords the flexibility that states have to have to
850	address local energy challenges. This legislation continues
851	the committee's extensive record focused on cyber
852	preparedness, infrastructure resilience, and emergency
853	response.
854	I look forward to continued bipartisan discussions as we
855	move forward in finalizing the bill, and I yield back the
856	balance of my time.
857	Are there other members wishing to speak other
858	members wishing to speak on the bill?
859	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman?
860	The Chairman. The gentleman from Illinois.
861	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.
862	The Chairman. Strike the last word. He is recognized
863	for 5 minutes.
864	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the majority
865	for working with the minority on this particular piece of
866	legislation. But, again, Mr. Chairman, we would have
867	preferred to follow regular order on this bill. As you know,

868	many members on our side of the aisle support the State
869	Energy Program, and this bill would provide resources to
870	further develop and enhance the state energy security plans.
871	Funding provided in this bill would help states to
872	implement, revise, and review their energy security plans
873	while also laying out criteria for the contents of these
874	bills. Although the subcommittee has not held a legislative
875	hearing on this draft bill, I am confident that if both sides
876	continue to work together in good faith we can come to an
877	agreement that will garner the overwhelming support of
878	members from both sides of the aisle.
879	So, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to continuing the
880	discussions between the majority and the minority committee
881	staff, and it is my hope and expectation that we will
882	finalize a bill that will go a long way in helping states
883	prepare plans to help mitigate for and respond to energy
884	emergencies, whether they be natural or manmade, physical or
885	cyber.
886	Mr. Chairman
887	The Chairman. Would the gentleman yield?
888	Mr. Rush. certainly will yield. I appreciate the
889	gentleman's comments, and I just want to give the assurance
890	that we continue to work with both sides. This is a

891	bipartisan effort	, has been from the very start. I lament
892	that we were not	able to have a legislative hearing, but, as
893	we all know, last	week we had the tragic shooting, and we
894	decided that we n	eeded to cancel our official duties for that
895	day.	
896	We had a num	ber of witnesses that flew in from a variety
897	of different stat	es. Because we did cancel the hearing
898	itself, we still	went ahead with the staff briefing that was,
899	as I understand i	t, bipartisan. And because of the
900	importance of thi	s issue, knowing that we have had some
901	classified briefi	ngs as well, we thought that it was
902	important to use	this window of opportunity to move forward
903	with the subcommi	ttee mark, and allow us still time before it
904	gets to full comm	ittee and ultimately to the House floor.
905	But I just w	ant to assure every member here that as one
906	that does support	regular order, this is an important issue
907	and it was only b	ecause of the tragedy last week that we were
908	forced to cancel	the official legislative hearing. But as I
909	understand it, a	number of different discussions, we are all
910	together on the s	ame page wanting this legislation to move
911	forward and will	continue to work before it gets scheduled
912	before the full ¢	ommittee.
913	And I apprec	iate the gentleman's interest, his input,

This is an	unedited	transcript.	The	statements	within	may	be
inaccurate,	, incomple	te, or misattı	ribut	ed to the spe	eaker.		

914	and his sincere effort to work with us to get a bill that we
915	can pass on the House floor with broad bipartisan support. I
916	appreciate that.
917	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time. I just
918	want, in whatever time I have left, I just want to understate
919	or underline and reemphasize that we are absolutely dedicated
920	to the ongoing, longstanding principle of this subcommittee
921	that we do have regular order on the matters that are before
922	the subcommittee.
923	And, Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield back.
924	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
925	wishing to speak on the bill? The gentleman from Texas, Mr.
926	Barton.
927	Mr. Barton. Thank you.
928	The Chairman. Strike the last word?
929	Mr. Barton. Yes, sir. I want to reemphasize, Mr.
930	Chairman, what you just said. We were supposed to have a
931	legislative hearing last Wednesday. I was inadvertently
932	detained out at the baseball practice, and I think at the
933	time the hearing was supposed to have occurred I was in an
934	argument with the FBI trying to get my car out of the parking
935	lot where the hearing occurred. So I couldn't have been
936	here, but

937	Mr. Shimkus.	Which you lost that argument, didn't you?
938	Mr. Barton.	I did. I did lose that argument, very
939	emphatically actu	ally.
940	But I just v	ant to reinforce your remarks and also let -
941	- and as Mr. Rush	knows, we try to be, and most of the time
942	are, very biparti	san, and his staff, my staff, your staff,
943	and Mr. McNerney	s staff, as we are in ongoing discussions
944	about efforts to	improve the bill and its aspects of
945	cybersecurity, ar	nd things of that sort.
946	So we didn't	have the legislative markup. But if there
947	was ever a legiti	mate reason to postpone it or cancel it, I
948	think last week o	ualifies. And I also just want to commend
949	Mr. Doyle for two	things. He could not have been more
950	gracious last Wed	nesday in his efforts to reach out to me and
951	all of the Republ	icans on the baseball team, and I want to
952	congratulate him	for the victory last Thursday. Don't think
953	that that is goir	g to become a continuing thing, though, Mr.
954	Doyle. We will k	e back next year.
955	Mr. Shimkus,	who is one of our players, played his 21st
956	game, and he pite	hed a perfect inning last week, struck out
957	two. So he may k	e our starting pitcher, if I can get him to
958	come to a few mon	e practices next year. I am going to have
959	to negotiate with	his agent on what it is going to take to

960	get him out, but	he played exceptionally well.
961	So, anyway,	we didn't have the legislative hearing
962	because, as the c	hairman pointed out, there was something
963	that had happened	that was fairly traumatic.
964	Mr. Rush. W	ill the gentleman yield?
965	Mr. Barton.	I would be happy to yield.
966	Mr. Rush.	just you know, I don't want to quibble
967	over this, becaus	e I understand the spirit of what both the
968	gentleman from Te	xas and the chairman is remarking on on this
969	bill. But I want	to remind the chairman and the gentleman
970	from Texas that t	he hearing on Thursday was an oversight
971	hearing. It was	not a legislative hearing. As a matter of
972	fact	
973	Mr. Barton.	I am talking about last Wednesday.
974	Mr. Rush.	understand. But I want you my point is
975	that on Friday wa	s the date that we actually got the bill.
976	We didn't get the	bill until Friday. So we all were very
977	concerned and fix	ated on the predicament of our colleague and
978	the Capitol Hill	Police officer and the members who were on
979	the baseball team	•
980	But we didn	t get this bill until Friday of last week,
981	so it would not h	ave
982	Mr. Barton.	You are correct. That is not a quibble,

983	Mr. Ranking Member. You are right about that.
984	Mr. Rush. yield.
985	Mr. Barton. And I yield back.
986	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
987	wishing to speak? Seeing none, are there bipartisan
988	amendments to the bill? Seeing none, are there amendments to
989	the bill?
990	Seeing none, the question now occurs on forwarding the
991	Enhancing State Energy Security Planning and Emergency
992	Preparedness Act to the full committee.
993	All those in favor will say aye.
994	Those opposed, say no.
995	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the
996	bill is forwarded on.
997	The chair now calls up H.R. 2883 and asks the clerk to
998	report.
999	[The bill follows:]
1000	**************************************

4	1	8

1001	Ms. Giannangeli. H.R. 2883, to establish a more
1002	uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the
1003	construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of
1004	international border-crossing facilities for the import and
1005	export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of
1006	electricity.
1007	The Chairman. And, without objection, the first reading
1008	of the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for
1009	amendment at any point. So ordered.
1010	Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Seeing
1011	none, are there any amendments to the bill?
1012	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman?
1013	The Chairman. The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr.
1014	Pallone, has an amendment at the desk?
1015	Mr. Pallone I have an amendment at the desk.
1016	The Chairman. The gentleman has an amendment at the
1017	desk. The clerk will report the title.
1018	[The amendment offered by Mr. Pallone follows:]
1019	*********COMMITTEE INSERT 3******

1020	Ms. Giannangeli. Amendment to H.R. 2883, offered by Mr.
1021	Pallone.
1022	The Chairman. And, without objection, the amendment is
1023	the reading of the amendment is dispensed with. Staff
1024	will distribute the amendment, and the gentleman is
1025	recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.
1026	Mr. Pallone Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My amendment
1027	ensures that the complete length of cross-border projects
1028	would be subject to full environmental review under the
1029	National Environmental Policy Act. NEPA was created to
1030	provide transparency so people know what the impact of a
1031	project will be on their communities.
1032	However, the provisions of H.R. 2883 would circumvent
1033	that transparency, and that is why I have introduced this
1034	amendment, to include the entirety of a transboundary project
1035	and the definition of border-crossing facility. By ensuring
1036	a federal NEPA review is conducted for the entire length of
1037	these projects, we can make certain that the necessary steps
1038	are taken to protect the public interest and preserve our
1039	tremendous natural resources.
1040	My amendment is necessary since the bill redefines and
1041	significantly narrows the scope of NEPA's environmental
1042	review. While traditional NEPA review looks at the impacts

1043	of an entire project, this bill restricts NEPA review to only
1044	that portion of a project that physically crosses the border.
1045	And this restriction, in my opinion, is problematic.
1046	These massive projects are more than just a border crossing.
1047	When we approve a transboundary pipeline or transmission
1048	line, we are approving multi-billion dollar infrastructure
1049	that may stretch hundreds of miles and will last for decades.
1050	These projects pass through private property and
1051	sensitive lands. They transport hazardous substances that,
1052	if spilled or ignited, can cause serious damage. Before
1053	making decisions about whether to approve such projects, we
1054	need to carefully consider their potential impacts on the
1055	environment and on communities along their routes. And,
1056	simply put, we should be looking at the effects of projects
1057	as a whole.
1058	But that is not what the bill before us does. Instead,
1059	it redefines the scope of NEPA's inquiry to only encompass
1060	the step across the border. When Congress passed NEPA, it
1061	never intended this law to provide such a narrow review.
1062	Congress intended NEPA to provide policymakers with a
1063	critical tool to understand the project's full environmental
1064	impacts and consider lower impact alternatives.
1065	NEPA doesn't dictate the outcome or impose any

1066	constraint on projects. It simply requires the Federal
1067	Government to make some effort to understand the
1068	environmental impacts of major federal actions and to inform
1069	the public of those impacts.
1070	Fundamentally, NEPA requires us to look before we leap,
1071	which is just common sense. We should not be carelessly
1072	narrowing or creating loopholes in this law.
1073	When the Federal Government makes a decision about a
1074	major project, it should understand what is going on. Large
1075	energy projects often raise safety issues, economic
1076	implications, and environmental concerns both for the local
1077	and global environments. These projects affect communities
1078	all along their routes.
1079	Ignoring the impacts will not make them disappear. It
1080	is simply common sense that we should understand the broad
1081	scope of these impacts before deciding to approve a project.
1082	And that is why urge all of my colleagues to support this
1083	important amendment that ensures that the complete length of
1084	cross-border projects will be subject to a full NEPA review.
1085	And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
1086	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. The chair
1087	recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Mullin.
1088	Mr. Mullin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And while I

greatly have respect for Ranking Member Pallone, I do want to point out a couple of things. The first thing, this legislation has absolutely nothing in it that would repeal environmental protection that is already applicable to pipelines, or it will hinder in any way the ability of federal agencies or states to carry out their statutory responsibilities

So we are not making any changes to any environmental study. All this bill does is simply remove the process out for excuses. We have seen too long the Keystone Pipeline that was being used as an excuse, and layers of red tape was put in there, so this legislation defines "border crossing facility" to mean the portion of the pipeline that is located at the international boundary only.

This amendment would try to expand the definition of the border crossing facility to include the entire length of the pipeline, which would infringe on a state's rights to receive and decide the impacts of the other portions of the pipeline. This bill has been carefully crafted with bipartisan support to be protective of public safety and the environment.

This amendment would upset this careful balance that we have had with bipartisan support and effectively gut this bill, so I would urge my colleagues to vote no on this

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1112	amendment.	
1113	Mr. Green.	Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman yield?
1114	Mr. Mullin.	Yes, I would yield to Mr. Green.
1115	Mr. Green.	Thank you. We had this bill last Congress,
1116	and we requested	a Congressional Research Service, and I
1117	would be glad to	hand out the copies based on the last. And
1118	I think the langu	age is the same in this bill as it was for
1119	the last one, if	my colleagues would like to see a copy of
1120	what the CRS talk	sed about.
1121	Before feder	al agents can make a final decision on a
1122	proposed action,	NEPA requires that the agency identify the
1123	proposal's effect	s on the quality of human environment. The
1124	scope and level of	f review required under NEPA depends on
1125	whether these eff	ects will be significant. To make that
1126	determination, ea	ach agency must identify and evaluate the
1127	proposal.	
1128	This bill do	esn't change that. There will still be a
1129	NEPA process not	just at the cross-border the crossing the
1130	border, but also	along the route that it will trigger a NEPA
1131	process.	
1132	The amendmer	nt I don't think is necessary. I think it
1133	will already be o	covered because, again, I am familiar with
1134	the border of Tex	as and the pipelines. There will not be a

1135	pipeline that goes into Mexico that doesn't cross some
1136	federal property, a wildlife refuge, or something else that
1137	will trigger a NEPA review.
1138	So, I mean, I can't say that about the Canadian border.
1139	Maybe my colleagues from northern but this bill does not
1140	take away any NEPA oversight that is currently in the law.
1141	And I appreciate my colleague from Oklahoma. I will
1142	quit for about a day complaining you are still taking our
1143	football players
1144	And I will yield back.
1145	Mr. Barton. Would the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to
1146	me?
1147	Mr. Mullin. Yes.
1148	Mr. Barton. I want to reinforce what you just said.
1149	The whole point of this bill is to put into statute to
1150	replace an ambiguous non-statutory certification process by
1151	the President, which is just kind of happenstance, really.
1152	And so what Mr. Green and Mr. Mullin are trying to do is
1153	put in clear statute a simple, understandable, time-certain
1154	process. If we accepted Mr. Pallone's amendment, as
1155	Markwayne pointed out, you would basically gut the bill. So
1156	I want to reinforce the opposition.
1157	I also want to take point of personal privilege. We

1158	have talked a lot about the members and people that were at
1159	the baseball practice last week when the shooting occurred.
1160	At the back of the room, we have a gentleman named Brian
1161	Kelly. He is at the very back left-hand corner. He is the
1162	Republican umpire, and he hits fungos to the outfield and is
1163	just a volunteer who comes out and helps us.
1164	Last week he risked his life. He came behind where the
1165	Capitol Hill Police were and was direct they couldn't see
1166	the shooter, and Brian actually risked his body to see where
1167	the shooter was and direct the Capitol Hill officers to where
1168	the shooter was shooting at the members. If he will stand
1169	up, we should recognize him.
1170	[Applause.]
1171	Mr. Barton. He is one of the unsung heroes and a
1172	tremendously good guy.
1173	And with that, I yield back to Markwayne.
1174	Mr. Mullin. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
1175	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
1176	wishing to speak on the amendment? The gentleman from
1177	California is recognized for 5 minutes.
1178	Mr. McNerney. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I yield my
1179	time to the ranking member.
1180	Mr. Pallone Thank you, Mr. McNerney. I don't I am

1181	not going to spend a lot of time, but, you know, I looked at
1182	the CRS memo that Mr. Green just provided, and my concern is
1183	not and the reason for this amendment is not alleviated,
1184	in my opinion, by this memo because there is really no
1185	guarantee that if you limit the scope of the review under the
1186	existing bill to just that section that crosses the border,
1187	there is no guarantee that NEPA is going to look beyond that
1188	and look at the whole project.
1189	And even though I mean, looking at this memo, it
1190	doesn't in any way suggest that that guarantee would be
1191	there. I mean, guess there is nothing to stop NEPA from
1192	looking at other things, but they wouldn't be under any
1193	charge or any requirement to do that under the bill. And so
1194	that is why it is necessary to have the amendment to specify
1195	that they would look at the entire project and not just that
1196	section that crosses the border.
1197	And with that, I yield back to Mr. McNerney.
1198	Mr. McNerney. And I will yield back.
1199	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
1200	wishing to speak on the amendment? The gentlelady from
1201	Florida, Ms. Castor.
1202	Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to urge
1203	adoption of the Pallone amendment, which would substantially

1204	improve this bill. H.R. 2883 proposes to eliminate
1205	meaningful review of all environmental impacts of proposed
1206	cross-border energy projects.
1207	The bill narrowly dramatically narrows the scope of
1208	environmental review to only the cross-border segment of the
1209	energy project, the tiny portion that physically crosses the
1210	national boundary. That is very poor public policy, and it
1211	significantly comtravenes important safeguards and the public
1212	interest.
1213	We are talking about major infrastructure projects that
1214	can span hundreds of miles. They cross through private
1215	property, through water bodies, farms, and other sensitive
1216	areas, and they carry substances that can catch fire or spill
1217	or pollute the environment. And they can have profound
1218	implications for the changing climate and all of the huge
1219	costs that are now being imposed upon families and
1220	businesses.
1221	To understand the potential environment impact of an
1222	energy project, you must look at the project as a whole. To
1223	ignore the potential environmental or safety risks for every
1224	part of the project except for the tiny sliver of land at the
1225	national boundary is irresponsible.
1226	Imagine going to the doctor, if you are feeling sick,

1227	and the doctor says, "I am giving you a clean bill of health"
1228	after only looking at your elbow. That is what this bill
1229	does. It lets these projects go forward without a full
1230	environmental review, and no meaningful review means no
1231	opportunity to mitigate potential harm to the public health,
1232	public safety, or the environment, and that is just reckless.
1233	And I think this will have the opposite effect of what is
1234	intended.
1235	I think you will probably see more lawsuits, more
1236	protests, greater delays, and, again, that would be just the
1237	opposite of what is intended.
1238	Mr. Pallone s amendment would ensure that these cross-
1239	border energy projects receive a thorough environmental
1240	review before they receive approval, and I urge adoption of
1241	the amendment and yield back my time.
1242	The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back. Other
1243	members wishing to speak on the amendment?
1244	Seeing none, the vote occurs on the amendment offered by
1245	the gentleman from New Jersey. A roll call vote has been
1246	requested. The clerk will call the roll. All those in favor
1247	of the amendment will vote aye. Those opposed will vote no.
1248	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson.
1249	Mr. Olson. No.

1250	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson votes no.
1251	Mr. Barton.
1252	Mr. Barton. No.
1253	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Barton votes no.
1254	Mr. Shimkus
1255	[No response.]
1256	Mr. Murphy.
1257	Mr. Murphy. No.
1258	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Murphy votes no.
1259	Mr. Latta.
1260	Mr. Latta. No.
1261	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Latta votes no.
1262	Mr. Harper.
1263	Mr. Harper. No.
1264	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Harper votes no.
1265	Mr. McKinley.
1266	Mr. McKinley. No.
1267	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McKinley votes no.
1268	Mr. Kinzinger.
1269	[No response.]
1270	Mr. Griffith.
1271	Mr. Griffith. No.
1272	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Griffith votes no.
	Π

	maccurate, incomplete, or impattibuted to the speaker.	60
1273	Mr. Johnson	
1274	Mr. Johnson No.	
1275	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Johnson votes no.	
1276	Mr. Long.	
1277	[No response.]	
1278	Mr. Bucshon	
1279	Mr. Bucshon. No.	
1280	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Bucshon votes no.	
1281	Mr. Flores.	
1282	Mr. Flores. No.	
1283	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Flores votes no.	
1284	Mr. Mullin.	
1285	Mr. Mullin. No.	
1286	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Mullin votes no.	
1287	Mr. Hudson.	
1288	Mr. Hudson. No.	
1289	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Hudson votes no.	
1290	Mr. Cramer.	
1291	Mr. Cramer. No.	
1292	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Cramer votes no.	
1293	Mr. Walberg.	
1294	Mr. Walberg. No.	
1295	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walberg votes no.	

mace	curate, incomplete, or misaturbuted to the speaker.	61
1296	Mr. Walden.	
1297	Mr. Walden. No.	
1298	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walden votes no.	
1299	Mr. Rush.	
1300	Mr. Rush. Aye.	
1301	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Rush votes aye.	
1302	Mr. McNerney.	
1303	Mr. McNerney. Aye.	
1304	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McNerney votes aye.	
1305	Mr. Peters.	
1306	Mr. Peters. Aye.	
1307	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Peters votes aye.	
1308	Mr. Green.	
1309	Mr. Green. No.	
1310	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Green votes no.	
1311	Mr. Doyle.	
1312	Mr. Doyle. Yes.	
1313	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Doyle votes aye.	
1314	Ms. Castor.	
1315	Ms. Castor. Aye.	
1316	Ms. Giannangeli. Ms. Castor votes aye.	
1317	Mr. Sarbanes.	
1318	Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.	
	11	

1319	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.
1320	Mr. Welch.
1321	Mr. Welch. Aye.
1322	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Welch votes aye.
1323	Mr. Tonko.
1324	Mr. Tonko. Aye.
1325	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Tonko votes aye.
1326	Mr. Loebsack.
1327	Mr. Loebsack. Aye.
1328	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Loebsack votes aye.
1329	Mr. Schrader.
1330	[No response.]
1331	Mr. Kennedy
1332	Mr. Kennedy Aye.
1333	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Kennedy votes aye.
1334	Mr. Butterfield.
1335	Mr. Butterfield. Aye.
1336	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Butterfield votes aye.
1337	Mr. Pallone
1338	Mr. Pallone Aye.
1339	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Pallone votes aye.
1340	Chairman Upton.
1341	The Chairman. Votes no.

1342	Ms. Giannangeli. Chairman Upton votes no.
1343	The Chairman. How does Mr. Shimkus vote?
1344	Mr. Shimkus. I vote no.
1345	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Shimkus votes no.
1346	The Chairman. Other members wishing to change their
1347	vote or to vote? Seeing none, the clerk will report the
1348	tally.
1349	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there were
1350	12 ayes and 18 noes.
1351	The Chairman. 12 ayes, 18 noes. The amendment is not
1352	agreed to.
1353	Are there other further amendments to the bill? The
1354	chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois to offer an
1355	amendment, Mr. Rush.
1356	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the
1357	desk.
1358	[The amendment offered by Mr. Rush follows:]
1359	**************************************

1360	The Chairman. And the clerk will report the amendment.
1361	Ms. Giannangeli. Amendment to H.R. 2883, offered by Mr.
1362	Rush.
1363	The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as
1364	read. The staff will distribute the amendment, and the
1365	gentleman from I linois is recognized for 5 minutes in
1366	support of his amendment.
1367	Mr. Rush. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, my
1368	amendment will simply retain the current requirement that the
1369	permitting agency must find that a project is in the public
1370	interest before the project is approved. Mr. Chairman, the
1371	stated objective of H.R. 2883 is to, I quote, "Is to
1372	establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to
1373	authorize the construction, connection, operation, and
1374	maintenance of international border crossing facilities for
1375	the import and export of oil and natural gas and the
1376	transmission of electricity."
1377	However, Mr Chairman, H.R. 2883 appears to be less
1378	about expediting the permitting process for cross-border
1379	pipelines and transmission lines and more about creating a
1380	de facto rubber stamp for these projects.
1381	Mr. Chairman, this bill tips the scales in favor of an
1382	automatic approval in two key ways. First, the new process

established by the bill effectively exempts such projects 1383 1384 from environmental safety and review under the National --1385 under NEPA by narrowing NEPA applicability to the -- just the 1386 portions of the project actually crossing the border. 1387 Additionally, the process created by the bill also tips 1388 the scale in favor of approving controversial projects by establishing a rebuttable presumption of approval. 1389 Chairman, the existing process requires an agency to 1390 1391 affirmatively find that a project is in the public interest, but instead this bill shifts the burden of proof to opponents 1392 1393 of the project to demonstrate otherwise. 1394 In fact, H.R. 2883 will allow a project that was found 1395 not to be in the public interest under the current permitting 1396 process to reapply under the new weaker process. Chairman, these massive cross-border energy projects could 1397 1398 have a significant impact on people's lives, and we owe it to the American people to make a real effort to understand those 1399 impacts before deciding whether or not to approve an 1400 1401 application.

Using information developed under NEPA, the current public interest standard allows all of the relevant potential impacts of a project to be considered and mitigated, where possible, and where appropriate. But I am concerned that the

1402

1403

1404

1406	bill's new permitting provision will actually make the
1407	process worse, less transparent, less inclusive, and
1408	ultimately less - far less effective.
1409	Mr. Chairman, this bill would drastically narrow what
1410	can be considered in evaluating these projects. And together
1411	with the 120-day time limit imposed in the bill, these
1412	provisions basically require the permitting agencies to
1413	rubber stamp all cross-border projects.
1414	Mr. Chairman, despite the intended objective of this
1415	bill, by narrowing the scope of NEPA, limiting public
1416	participation and shifting the burden of determining public
1417	interest, this bill may actually lead to greater controversy,
1418	increased litigation, and longer delays.
1419	With that said, Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my
1420	colleagues to support my amendment. And with that, I yield
1421	back the balance of my time.
1422	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back, and I would
1423	ask to strike the last word. I would recognize myself for 5
1424	minutes.
1425	I would argue that the underlying bill, 2883, actually
1426	would establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern
1427	process to authorize the construction of pipelines in the
1428	electric transmission facilities literally at the border.

1429	Canada and Mexico are two of our most trusted allies and
1430	trading partners And unless there is a good reason to
1431	believe that trade with these countries is for some reason
1432	not in the national interest, border crossing facilities
1433	should be approved.
1434	We actually have a longstanding precedent for a
1435	rebuttable presumption in favor of trade with our allies.
1436	The Natural Gas Act, for example, contains the very same
1437	standard of review. Language is the same. So this amendment
1438	would gut the bill, and I would urge my colleagues to vote no
1439	on the amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.
1440	Mr. Green. Mr. Chairman, would you yield?
1441	The Chairman. I yield, then, to the gentleman from the
1442	Texas.
1443	Mr. Green. Thank you. This amendment, I think, because
1444	of the rebuttable presumption, we have a free trade agreement
1445	with our two borders. We are not going to build pipelines to
1446	Cuba. We are not going to build pipelines to anywhere except
1447	Canada or Mexico We have a free trade agreement, and that
1448	is why the rebuttable presumption.
1449	Now, I have to admit, in 1993, I did not vote for NAFTA,
1450	but I think over a period of time we can change it. But the
1451	success of what is happening on the Texas border now is

1452	Mexico needs our natural gas, and to get there, the
1453	permitting process has been a struggle, just because of what
1454	the experience of Keystone.
1455	And so that is why we are trying to make sure that
1456	between our free trading partner that we have that
1457	decision on rebuttable presumption is only made when Congress
1458	approved these free trade agreements. And so that is why I
1459	think we are just putting into the law what should be common
1460	sense, that if you have a free trade agreement with someone,
1461	you ought to make it a rebuttable presumption. It is in the
1462	national interest, because that is why.
1463	And thank you for yielding to me.
1464	The Chairman. With that, I yield back the balance of my
1465	time. Other members wishing to speak on the amendment? The
1466	gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Pallone.
1467	Mr. Pallone Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak
1468	in support of Mr Rush's amendment. I was listening to your
1469	remarks about our great relationship with Mexico and Canada.
1470	I am not so sure that is true anymore with President Trump,
1471	but whatever. Hope springs eternal.
1472	H.R. 2883 establishes a new permitting process that
1473	appears to have one goal: ensuring rapid approval of cross-
1474	border energy projects. The bill makes it very difficult for

federal agencies to do anything other than approve the proposed projects for two reasons.

First, based on the reason for my initial amendment is the new permitting process narrows the federal approval and environmental review to just the cross-border portion of the proposed project, and this eliminates consideration of the concerns that stem from the project as a whole.

And then, second, the reason for Mr. Rush's amendment, is that the bill establishes a rebuttable presumption of approval, meaning that the federal agency must approve the project unless it finds that the cross-border segment of the project is not in the public interest. So that is a major change. And it is not a subtle change -- a significant change--that makes it much more likely that these projects will be approved even if the record is incomplete.

To put it another way, this bill effectively says that all oil and natural gas pipelines and electricity transmission lines that cross the U.S. border are always in the public interest. And to prove otherwise, federal agencies can only consider the impacts of these projects at the narrow segment that crosses the border. That is an extremely high bar to meet. And for what? To guarantee that every project gets the green light, regardless of the merits?

1498	We should keep in mind that the purpose of the current
1499	presidential permit requirement is to ensure that when a
1500	private company plans to build a massive infrastructure
1501	project across the U.S. border, the executive branch has a
1502	chance to evaluate the project.
1503	The purpose is to ensure that we understand the
1504	project's potential effects on foreign policy, trade, the
1505	economy, the environment, public health and safety, and other
1506	factors. And the purpose is also to address any unacceptable
1507	effects through permit conditions or denial, if necessary.
1508	But the process established in this bill would only serve the
1509	purpose of approving all projects more quickly.
1510	By shifting the burden of proof to require a showing
1511	that the project is contrary to the public interest and
1512	sharply narrowing the focus of that inquiry, this bill makes
1513	it extremely difficult for an agency ever to deny a permit.
1514	And that is not something that I can support, and I don't
1515	think we should support, so I am glad Mr. Rush is offering
1516	this amendment today, and I urge a yes vote.
1517	I yield back.
1518	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
1519	wishing to speak on the amendments? Seeing none, the vote
1520	occurs on the amendment.

1521	A recorded vote is asked on the amendment. The clerk
1522	will call the roll on the Rush amendment. Those in favor
1523	will say aye. Those opposed, say no. The clerk will call
1524	the roll.
1525	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson.
1526	Mr. Olson. No.
1527	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson votes no.
1528	Mr. Barton.
1529	Mr. Barton. No.
1530	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Barton votes no.
1531	Mr. Shimkus
1532	Mr. Shimkus. No.
1533	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Shimkus votes no.
1534	Mr. Murphy.
1535	Mr. Murphy. No.
1536	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Murphy votes no.
1537	Mr. Latta.
1538	Mr. Latta. No.
1539	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Latta votes no.
1540	Mr. Harper.
1541	Mr. Harper. No.
1542	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Harper votes no.
1543	Mr. McKinley.

		, <u>-</u>
1544	Mr. McKinley. No.	
1545	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McKinley votes no.	
1546	Mr. Kinzinger.	
1547	[No response.]	
1548	Mr. Griffith.	
1549	Mr. Griffith. No.	
1550	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Griffith votes no.	
1551	Mr. Johnson	
1552	Mr. Johnson No.	
1553	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Johnson votes no.	
1554	Mr. Long.	
1555	[No response.]	
1556	Mr. Bucshon.	
1557	[No response.]	
1558	Mr. Flores.	
1559	Mr. Flores. No.	
1560	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Flores votes no.	
1561	Mr. Mullin.	
1562	Mr. Mullin. No.	
1563	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Mullin votes no.	
1564	Mr. Hudson.	
1565	Mr. Hudson. No.	
1566	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Hudson votes no.	

		13
1567	Mr. Cramer.	
1568	Mr. Cramer. No.	
1569	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Cramer votes no.	
1570	Mr. Walberg	
1571	Mr. Walberg No.	
1572	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walberg votes no.	
1573	Mr. Walden.	
1574	[No response.]	
1575	Mr. Rush.	
1576	Mr. Rush. Aye.	
1577	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Rush votes aye.	
1578	Mr. McNerney.	
1579	Mr. McNerney. Yes.	
1580	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McNerney votes aye.	
1581	Mr. Peters.	
1582	Mr. Peters. Aye.	
1583	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Peters votes aye.	
1584	Mr. Green.	
1585	Mr. Green. No.	
1586	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Green votes no.	
1587	Mr. Doyle.	
1588	Mr. Doyle. Yes.	
1589	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Doyle votes aye.	

	maccurate, incomplete, or impattitioned to the speaker.	74
1590	Ms. Castor.	
1591	Ms. Castor. Aye.	
1592	Ms. Giannangeli. Ms. Castor votes aye.	
1593	Mr. Sarbanes.	
1594	Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.	
1595	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.	
1596	Mr. Welch.	
1597	Mr. Welch. Aye.	
1598	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Welch votes aye.	
1599	Mr. Tonko.	
1600	Mr. Tonko. Aye.	
1601	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Tonko votes aye.	
1602	Mr. Loebsack.	
1603	Mr. Loebsack. Aye.	
1604	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Loebsack votes aye.	
1605	Mr. Schrader.	
1606	Mr. Schrader. Yes.	
1607	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Schrader votes aye.	
1608	Mr. Kennedy	
1609	Mr. Kennedy. Aye.	
1610	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Kennedy votes aye.	
1611	Mr. Butterfield.	
1612	Mr. Butterfield. Aye.	

1613	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Butterfield votes aye.
1614	Mr. Pallone
1615	Mr. Pallone Aye.
1616	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Pallone votes aye.
1617	Chairman Upton.
1618	The Chairman. Votes no.
1619	Ms. Giannangeli. Chairman Upton votes no.
1620	The Chairman. How is Mr. Walden recorded?
1621	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walden is not recorded.
1622	Mr. Walden. No.
1623	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walden votes no.
1624	The Chairman. How is Mr. Bucshon recorded?
1625	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Bucshon is not recorded.
1626	Mr. Bucshon No.
1627	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Bucshon votes no.
1628	The Chairman. Other members wishing to change their
1629	vote or cast a vote? Seeing none, the clerk will report the
1630	tally.
1631	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there were
1632	13 ayes and 18 noes.
1633	The Chairman. 13 ayes, 18 noes. The amendment is not
1634	agreed to.
1635	Are there further amendments to the bill? Seeing none,

	, ,
1636	the vote occurs on forwarding H.R. 2883 to the full
1637	committee.
1638	Mr. Rush. want a recorded vote.
1639	The Chairman. A recorded vote has been asked for. All
1640	those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed, vote no. The
1641	clerk will call the roll.
1642	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson.
1643	Mr. Olson. Aye.
1644	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson votes aye.
1645	Mr. Barton.
1646	Mr. Barton. Aye.
1647	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Barton votes aye.
1648	Mr. Shimkus
1649	Mr. Shimkus. Aye.
1650	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Shimkus votes aye.
1651	Mr. Murphy.
1652	[No response.]
1653	Mr. Latta.
1654	Mr. Latta. Aye.
1655	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Latta votes aye.
1656	Mr. Harper.
1657	Mr. Harper. Aye.
1658	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Harper votes aye.

	maccurate, meonipiete, or misattributed to the speaker.	77
1659	Mr. McKinley.	
1660	Mr. McKinley. Aye.	
1661	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McKinley votes aye.	
1662	Mr. Kinzinger.	
1663	[No response.]	
1664	Mr. Griffith.	
1665	Mr. Griffith. Aye.	
1666	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Griffith votes aye.	
1667	Mr. Johnson	
1668	Mr. Johnson Aye.	
1669	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Johnson votes aye.	
1670	Mr. Long.	
1671	[No response.]	
1672	Mr. Bucshon	
1673	Mr. Bucshon Aye.	
1674	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Bucshon votes aye.	
1675	Mr. Flores.	
1676	Mr. Flores. Aye.	
1677	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Flores votes aye.	
1678	Mr. Mullin.	
1679	Mr. Mullin. Aye.	
1680	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Mullin votes aye.	
1681	Mr. Hudson.	

		/ 0
1682	Mr. Hudson. Aye.	
1683	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Hudson votes aye.	
1684	Mr. Cramer.	
1685	Mr. Cramer. Aye.	
1686	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Cramer votes aye.	
1687	Mr. Walberg	
1688	Mr. Walberg. Aye.	
1689	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walberg votes aye.	
1690	Mr. Walden.	
1691	Mr. Walden. Aye.	
1692	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walden votes aye.	
1693	Mr. Rush.	
1694	Mr. Rush. No.	
1695	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Rush votes no.	
1696	Mr. McNerney.	
1697	Mr. McNerney. No.	
1698	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McNerney votes no.	
1699	Mr. Peters.	
1700	Mr. Peters. No.	
1701	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Peters votes no.	
1702	Mr. Green.	
1703	Mr. Green. Aye.	
1704	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Green votes aye.	

		1)
1705	Mr. Doyle.	
1706	Mr. Doyle. No.	
1707	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Doyle votes no.	
1708	Ms. Castor.	
1709	Ms. Castor. No.	
1710	Ms. Giannangeli. Ms. Castor votes no.	
1711	Mr. Sarbanes.	
1712	Mr. Sarbanes. No.	
1713	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Sarbanes votes no.	
1714	Mr. Welch.	
1715	Mr. Welch. No.	
1716	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Welch votes no.	
1717	Mr. Tonko.	
1718	Mr. Tonko. No.	
1719	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Tonko votes no.	
1720	Mr. Loebsack.	
1721	Mr. Loebsack. No.	
1722	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Loebsack votes no.	
1723	Mr. Schrader.	
1724	Mr. Schrader. Aye.	
1725	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Schrader votes aye.	
1726	Mr. Kennedy.	
1727	Mr. Kennedy. No.	

\circ	^
\sim	l

1728	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Kennedy votes no.
1729	Mr. Butterfield.
1730	Mr. Butterfield. No.
1731	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Butterfield votes no.
1732	Mr. Pallone.
1733	Mr. Pallone. No.
1734	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Pallone votes no.
1735	Chairman Upton.
1736	The Chairman. Votes aye.
1737	Ms. Giannangeli. Chairman Upton votes aye.
1738	The Chairman. Other members wishing to change their
1739	vote or cast a vote? Seeing none, the clerk will report the
1740	tally.
1741	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there were
1742	12 ayes and 19 noes. Sorry. Mr. Chairman, on that vote,
1743	there were 19 ayes and 12 noes.
1744	The Chairman. 19 ayes and 12 noes. The question on
1745	forwarding 2883 is approved and forwarded to the full
1746	committee.
1747	The chair will now call up H.R. 2910 and ask the clerk
1748	to report.
1749	[The bill follows:]
1750	**************************************

1751	Ms. Giannangeli. H.R. 2910, to provide for federal and
1752	state excuse me. To provide for federal and state agency
1753	coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under
1754	the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes.
1755	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of
1756	the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for
1757	amendment at any point. Are there any bipartisan amendments
1758	to the bill? Seeing none, are there any amendments to the
1759	bill?
1760	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman?
1761	The Chairman. The gentleman from Illinois has an
1762	amendment at the desk?
1763	Mr. Rush. Yes, I have an amendment.
1764	The Chairman. The clerk will report the title of the
1765	amendment. What amendment number is it, do you know? 3.
1766	Mr. Rush. 3.
1767	Ms. Giannangeli. Amendment to H.R. 2910, offered by Mr.
1768	Rush.
1769	The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as
1770	read. The staff will distribute the amendment, and the
1771	gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in
1772	support of his amendment.
1773	Mr. Rush. want to thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr.

1774 Chairman, my amendment will simply strike Section 4 of the 1775 bill. H.R. 2910 is a bill that offers a solution in search 1776 of a problem.

This last month this subcommittee heard testimony from Director Terry Turpin of FERC's Office of Energy Projects in which he stated that 88 percent of applications are currently processed within 12 months. Additionally, Director Turpin noted that the number 1 reason for an application being delayed was due to the licensee failing to provide FERC and other agencies with, quote, "timely and complete information necessary to perform congressionally mandated project reviews."

Mr. Chairman, instead of actually addressing the main reason causing the delays for the 12 percent of applications that take over 12 months to approve, H.R. 2910 seeks to cut corners in a variety of ways and substitutes safety with expediency.

Mr. Chairman, while we all understand the need for an expanded energy infrastructure, it is extremely important to our constituents that these pipelines be constructed in a way that protects the environment and offers a sense of security to the communities which they traverse. Congress should not make it easier for private entities to claim eminent domain

1777

1778

1779

1780

1781

1782

1783

1784

1785

1786

1787

1788

1789

1790

1791

1792

1793

1794

1795

1797	and potentially megatively impact historical and cultural
1798	sites, aquifers, farms, and other private properties, while
1799	at the same time limiting the ability for states, for tribes,
1800	and for local communities to provide input into the process.
1801	Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2910 does exactly
1802	that. This bill will cut corners by allowing incomplete
1803	applications to be considered. The bill will also cut
1804	corners by allowing incomplete data from earlier surveys to
1805	be considered in the application process.
1806	This bill will cut corners by minimizing the input of
1807	states and agencies responsible for protecting the
1808	environment, sensitive lands, aquifers, and other natural
1809	resources.
1810	Mr. Chairman, this bill allows FERC to determine which
1811	agencies are deemed relevant to the application process. And
1812	if a state or agency is not deemed relevant to the process by
1813	FERC, then those stakeholders are completely shut out of the
1814	process.
1815	In fact, this bill will specifically prohibit non-
1816	designation agencies, including state organizations, from
1817	being able to, quote, "request or conduct a NEPA review that
1818	is supplemental to the project-related review conducted by
1819	the Commission." This bill will also prohibit, quote, "non-

1820	designation" of agencies from including comments or
1821	supplemental information into the record.
1822	Mr. Chairman, as we have seen in the past, and continue
1823	to witness today, the issue of constructing these pipelines
1824	through aquifers, private property, cultural sites, and other
1825	sensitive lands is an issue that causes great public
1826	consternation and public outcry.
1827	We should be taking into account the sensitive nature of
1828	this issue by listening to our constituents and making them
1829	feel as though we have more of a voice in these sometimes
1830	very difficult decisions, not trying to limit their input.
1831	Mr. Chairman, I would urge all of my colleagues to
1832	support my amendment striking Section 4 of the bill, so that
1833	states, tribes, and local community stakeholders can continue
1834	to play an important role in the pipeline permitting process.
1835	With that, yield back the balance of my time.
1836	Mr. Olson. [Presiding] The gentleman yields back.
1837	Does anyone want to speak in opposition to the amendment?
1838	Mr. Flores. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last
1839	word.
1840	Mr. Olson. Mr. Flores is recognized for 5 minutes.
1841	Mr. Flores. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the interest
1842	of time, I waive my opening comments regarding my bill, but I

will go ahead and talk about what the bill does because I think my bill was mischaracterized pretty dramatically in the statement regarding this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, America is one of the world's top oil and gas producers thanks to the shale revolution. Our energy infrastructure and permitting processes must be updated to reflect America's abundance of domestic energy resources.

Modernizing the permitting process for our Nation's pipeline infrastructure allows us to efficiently and safely bring those resources to our downstream assets openly to consumers to power our economy and to give opportunities for hardworking American families.

H.R. 2910, promoting interagency coordination for review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, builds important permit reforms under the Energy Policy Act of 2005 by bringing greater accountability, predictability, and transparency to the process for interstate pipelines.

This bill requires early notification to all participating agencies, all states, and all affected Indian tribes to lessen the burden of interagency bureaucracy, and it reinforces FERC's status as the lead agency. It further establishes a process for consultation and concurrent reviews among federal and state agencies, Indian tribes, and sets

deadlines for final decisions.

H.R. 2910 includes common-sense reforms, including codifying some of the Commission's existing practices in the statute. It is important to note that this process is more transparent and more accountable, and this bill enhances certainty for pipeline applicants. This bill does not guarantee a given outcome for any applicant. It does, however, ensure that the involved agencies follow their duty to act on appropriate projects and not push an ideological agenda by using delays and stall tactics. Expanding and modernizing our infrastructure brings additional benefits of creating jobs and means lower energy prices for hardworking American families.

Now, I want to go -- in particular response to the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman, again, I want to say H.R. 2910 encourages agencies to participate in the environmental review process. It cuts no corners, and this leads to better, more informed decisionmaking.

This amendment would do the complete opposite. It would discourage agencies from participating. It would lead to confusion, it would lead to duplication, and it would lead to delay. The need for new natural gas infrastructure is clear. It presents new opportunities for our economy and jobs, it

1889	strengthens our energy security, and reduces our domestic
1890	emissions.
1891	Now, one of the things that the gentleman said that
1892	sponsored the amendment, he said that 80 percent of the
1893	applications are on time, or timely issued. Okay. That is
1894	true. That means that 20 percent are late, and that 20
1895	percent represents a substantial increase from just a few
1896	years ago.
1897	Now, these delays and that 20 percent don't come without
1898	a cost, and so here are some examples. Project A, I am going
1899	to use as an example, it costs an additional 54 million
1900	versus an original \$607 million budget, which was over a 10
1901	percent increase
1902	Project B, as an example, was supposed to cost about
1903	\$683 million, but the projected loss of revenues due to the
1904	delays from the ack of coordination among the bureaucracies
1905	and the additional cost due to unbudgeted and duplicative
1906	regulatory process, was 118 million. In other words, total
1907	increased cost or lost revenues of \$691 million versus a
1908	\$683 million project, two times the original cost.
1909	Project C was supposed to cost \$2.56 billion, but the
1910	delays and bureaucratic overruns bureaucratic delay,
1911	bureaucratic cost, cost an additional half-million dollars,

1912	or a 20 percent increase.
1913	So that 20 percent, the 20 percent that are delayed,
1914	which, again, is way up, has a cost to our economy and has a
1915	cost on American jobs, and it delays these important
1916	projects. So I urge a no vote on the amendment, and a yes
1917	vote on the underlying bill.
1918	Thank you. I yield back.
1919	Mr. Olson. The gentleman yields back. The chair now
1920	calls upon the ranking member for an announcement.
1921	Mr. Rush. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I want to Tiffany, our
1922	staff here on this side, she created an uproar because she
1923	her water broke on this hearing, and so she is rushing home
1924	and possibly going to the hospital to have a baby.
1925	[Applause.]
1926	Mr. Shimkus Would the gentleman yield?
1927	Mr. Rush. Yes, I will.
1928	Mr. Shimkus I hope she has extended paternal leave, so
1929	we might be able to get things done, because she is a tough -
1930	- she is a tough negotiator.
1931	[Laughter.]
1932	Mr. Rush. Yeah, yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1933	Mr. Olson. All right. Is there statements in support
1934	of the amendment? The chair now calls upon the ranking

89

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1935	member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, for 5 minutes.
1936	Mr. Pallone Thank you, Mr. Chairman. She actually
1937	kept talking, even though she was supposed to go to the
1938	hospital. And I said, "Would you please get out of here," so
1939	she finally
1940	Mr. Shimkus I am shocked. She kept talking? I am
1941	shocked.
1942	Mr. Pallone She finally left.
1943	[Laughter.]
1944	Mr. Pallone Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I do want to speak
1945	in support of the Rush amendment. The section of the bill in
1946	question, to set up a new, more limited role for agencies not
1947	designated by FERC as participating agencies in the
1948	authorization process.
1949	This is an important distinction, as any agency not
1950	designated as participating would be greatly limited in their
1951	ability to participate in the project review process, and
1952	these agencies would be prohibited from requesting or
1953	conducting a supplemental NEPA review.
1954	Further, the bill would also prohibit FERC from
1955	considering any comments provided by these agencies during a
1956	project's NEPA review or even allow FERC to include any of
1957	their comments in the record of the review.

While the underlying intent of this provision remains unclear, it appears to be nothing more than an explicit attempt to weaken environmental protections and silence potential critics of certain projects. As written, this section of the bill would allow FERC to rather arbitrarily define which agencies are allowed to be involved in the review process while gagging others, and, in doing so, it would provide FERC with a mechanism to further limit public and state participation in the licensing process.

Natural gas projects are often massive in scale, affecting numerous property owners, surrounding communities, and the environment. And while I heard the Republican sponsor talk about additional costs, you know, I mean, the bottom line is that these are major projects that could have real problems. And so I understand your concern about additional costs, but we do have to make sure that they are not causing any potential damage. Because of the magnitude of their potential impact, we should be welcoming, not silencing, input from diverse stakeholders.

Now, my Republican colleagues might argue that by limiting participation in the NEPA review we can streamline and shorten the timeline for project approval, but there is no evidence to suggest that the approval process takes too

1981	long in the first place.
1982	As many have said, and as representatives of FERC have
1983	testified, nearly 90 percent of all new projects are
1984	certificated within 1 year. And with numbers like that, it
1985	is hard not to argue that the current review and approval
1986	framework is working just fine, in my opinion. So I support
1987	the amendment to strike the language in question and urge my
1988	colleagues to do the same.
1989	I yield back.
1990	Mr. Olson. The gentleman yields back. Does anyone want
1991	to speak in opposition to the amendment?
1992	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman?
1993	Mr. Olson. Does anyone want to speak in support of the
1994	amendment? Mr. Tonko from New York is recognized for 5
1995	minutes.
1996	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike
1997	the last word. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a
1998	clarifying question to counsel. On page 9, line 14, the new
1999	text states, and I quote, "If such application is
2000	sufficiently complete for the purposes of commencing
2001	consideration." Can staff please explain what a sufficiently
2002	complete application may or may not include?
2003	Mr. Mooney. There is no definition of "sufficiently

2004	complete." It would be left to the discretion of the agency
2005	involved.
2006	Mr. Tonko. So, in other words, it would be the
2007	responsibility of that agency to decide if an application is
2008	sufficiently complete, without
2009	Mr. Mooney. Correct.
2010	Mr. Tonko firm guidance in language in this bill?
2011	So who would that agency we would be relying on FERC,
2012	then?
2013	Mr. Mooney. It would be the agency that is involved in
2014	issuing the federal authorization.
2015	Mr. Tonko. So then would FERC evaluate this on a case-
2016	by-case basis, or is there existing guidance on what
2017	constitutes a sufficiently complete application?
2018	Mr. Mooney. It would be up to the agency to determine
2019	whether or not the application is sufficiently complete for
2020	the purposes of commencing consideration.
2021	Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chairman, I don't think this language is
2022	sufficiently drafted. There are too many ambiguities. We
2023	are asking FERC to make an undefined determination. Frankly,
2024	most of this bill is a solution in search of a problem. We
2025	have heard from FERC that 88 percent of projects are
2026	certified within 1 year following a completed application.

2027	And, yes, I believe it is incumbent on project
2028	developers to file completed applications before complaining
2029	that the process is too slow. I truly believe that some of
2030	these projects are necessary and in the public good, but
2031	there is not good evidence that we need to further tilt the
2032	process in favor of pipeline companies, which is what the
2033	proposed expediting process would do.
2034	Take, for instance, the remote survey section on
2035	page 11, F2. We heard testimony that aerial data have
2036	limitations and can be insufficient. These data may not
2037	account for historic sites, endangered species, or wetlands,
2038	but under this bill, agencies would be required to consider
2039	it. This bill does not include any standards or methodology
2040	requirements that must be met in order for an agency to be
2041	required to consider data from remote surveys.
2042	So state and federal agencies may be forced to consider
2043	very shoddy, unreliable data, without quality control
2044	requirements that might consider the degree of accuracy,
2045	scale, elevation, and many other factors. Granting
2046	conditional permits based on inadequate data will ultimately
2047	not speed up the process, but it will enable the rights of
2048	landowners being circumvented.
2049	Applicants would not need to make a good faith attempt

2050	to gain access to a private property owner's land, and in so
2051	doing help to make an important stakeholder aware that this
2052	project is being developed. Streamlining is fine, but we are
2053	talking about a process that can result in the use of eminent
2054	domain authority
2055	The bar for seizing private property should be high.
2056	Historically, it has been, is it in the public's interest?
2057	But this bill is helping to shift the question to, is it in
2058	the company's interest? And that is not acceptable to me.
2059	I would encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill and
2060	to support the amendments. And, with that, Mr. Chair, I
2061	yield back.
2062	Mr. Olson. The gentleman yields back. Is there any
2063	member seeking to speak in opposition to the amendment?
2064	Seeing none, is there a member who wants to speak in support
2065	of the amendment?
2066	The question now occurs on forwarding H.R. 2910 oh,
2067	the question now occurs on the Rush amendment. All those in
2068	favor, say aye.
2069	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, I want a roll call vote.
2070	Mr. Olson. A roll call vote has been requested. The
2071	clerk will call the roll.
2072	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson.

		<i>-</i>
2073	Mr. Olson. No.	
2074	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson votes no.	
2075	Mr. Barton.	
2076	Mr. Barton. No.	
2077	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Barton votes no.	
2078	Mr. Shimkus	
2079	Mr. Shimkus. No.	
2080	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Shimkus votes no.	
2081	Mr. Murphy.	
2082	Mr. Murphy. No.	
2083	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Murphy votes no.	
2084	Mr. Latta.	
2085	Mr. Latta. No.	
2086	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Latta votes no.	
2087	Mr. Harper.	
2088	Mr. Harper. No.	
2089	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Harper votes no.	
2090	Mr. McKinley.	
2091	Mr. McKinley. No.	
2092	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McKinley votes no.	
2093	Mr. Kinzinger.	
2094	[No response.]	
2095	Mr. Griffith.	

\sim	-
()	1-
9	۲

2096	Mr. Griffith. No.
2097	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Griffith votes no.
2098	Mr. Johnson
2099	Mr. Johnson No.
2100	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Johnson votes no.
2101	Mr. Long.
2102	[No response.]
2103	Mr. Bucshon
2104	Mr. Bucshon No.
2105	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Bucshon votes no.
2106	Mr. Flores.
2107	Mr. Flores. No.
2108	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Flores votes no.
2109	Mr. Mullin.
2110	Mr. Mullin. No.
2111	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Mullin votes no.
2112	Mr. Hudson.
2113	Mr. Hudson. No.
2114	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Hudson votes no.
2115	Mr. Cramer.
2116	Mr. Cramer. No.
2117	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Cramer votes no.
2118	Mr. Walberg
	II.

		91
2119	Mr. Walberg. No.	
2120	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walberg votes no.	
2121	Mr. Walden.	
2122	Mr. Walden. No.	
2123	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walden votes no.	
2124	Mr. Rush.	
2125	Mr. Rush. Aye.	
2126	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Rush votes aye.	
2127	Mr. McNerney.	
2128	Mr. McNerney. Aye.	
2129	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McNerney votes aye.	
2130	Mr. Peters.	
2131	Mr. Peters. Aye.	
2132	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Peters votes aye.	
2133	Mr. Green.	
2134	Mr. Green. Aye.	
2135	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Green votes aye.	
2136	Mr. Doyle.	
2137	Mr. Doyle. Yes.	
2138	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Doyle votes aye.	
2139	Ms. Castor.	
2140	Ms. Castor. Aye.	
2141	Ms. Giannangeli. Ms. Castor votes aye.	

		90
2142	Mr. Sarbanes.	
2143	Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.	
2144	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.	
2145	Mr. Welch.	
2146	Mr. Welch. Aye.	
2147	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Welch votes aye.	
2148	Mr. Tonko.	
2149	Mr. Tonko. Aye.	
2150	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Tonko votes aye.	
2151	Mr. Loebsack.	
2152	Mr. Loebsack. Aye.	
2153	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Loebsack votes aye.	
2154	Mr. Schrader.	
2155	Mr. Schrader. Aye.	
2156	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Schrader votes aye.	
2157	Mr. Kennedy	
2158	Mr. Kennedy Aye.	
2159	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Kennedy votes aye.	
2160	Mr. Butterfield.	
2161	Mr. Butterfield. Aye.	
2162	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Butterfield votes aye.	
2163	Mr. Pallone	
2164	Mr. Pallone Aye.	
	1.1	

2165	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Pallone votes aye.
2166	Chairman Upton.
2167	The Chairman. Votes no.
2168	Ms. Giannangeli. Chairman Upton votes no.
2169	The Chairman. [Presiding] Other members wishing to
2170	change their vote or cast a vote? Seeing none, the clerk
2171	will report the tally.
2172	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there were
2173	14 ayes and 17 noes.
2174	The Chairman. 14 ayes, 17 noes. The amendment is not
2175	agreed to.
2176	Are there further amendments to the bill? The gentleman
2177	from New Jersey, Mr. Pallone, has an amendment at the desk?
2178	Which number.
2179	Mr. Pallone It says 01, Mr. Chairman.
2180	The Chairman. 01? And the clerk will report the title
2181	of the amendment.
2182	[The amendment offered by Mr. Pallone follows:]
2183	*********COMMITTEE INSERT 5******

2184	Ms. Giannangeli. Amendment to H.R. 2910, offered by Mr.
2185	Pallone.
2186	The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as
2187	read. The staff will distribute the amendment, and the
2188	gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his
2189	amendment.
2190	Mr. Pallone Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment
2191	would strike the remote survey section of the bill, which
2192	places aerial survey data on the same footing with on-the-
2193	ground survey data for the purposes of the pipeline siting
2194	review process.
2195	Pipeline companies have been utilizing drones and other
2196	aircraft to survey private property more regularly in recent
2197	years, and this is problematic for a number of reasons.
2198	First, aerial survey data may not be able to accurately
2199	identify waterways that are present in the project area,
2200	particularly in heavily forested areas where tree cover may
2201	obscure a water body. Aerial surveys are similarly
2202	inadequate when it comes to identifying the potential impact
2203	on endangered species that may be present in the project
2204	area.
2205	And, further, this bill appears to be an effort to
2206	sidestep the rights of private landowners and local

on their property. There are important reasons why FERC and other federal agencies must utilize on-the-ground survey data to determine whether a gas pipeline can be constructed in a safe manner that minimizes impacts on local communities.

And while I understand FERC does not accept aerial data

-- I am sorry. While I understand FERC does accept aerial
data, not all federal and state agencies involved in this
process feel that these remote surveys are sufficient. In my
opinion, one of the main motives for this provision is to
give companies the ability to move through a significant
portion of the application process without property owners
having knowledge of their property being surveyed and
reviewed for a pipeline route.

Under this provision, it is possible that a property owner would not have knowledge that a company was evaluating their property for the purposes of a natural gas pipeline route until very late in the process when opportunities to intervene are more limited. This has been happening, actually, in my home state of New Jersey where the PennEast Pipeline has been proposed and homeowners have reported that companies are surveying their property by air without notification or consent.

2230	Property owners deserve to know if a company is planning
2231	to survey their property by air and if this data is going to
2232	be used to advance an application at FERC to site a pipeline
2233	on their property. And at the very minimum, the applicant
2234	should be required to obtain consent from the property owner.
2235	So I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment,
2236	and I yield back
2237	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. The chair
2238	would recognize the gentleman from Texas to speak on the
2239	amendment.
2240	Mr. Flores. Move to strike the last word.
2241	The Chairman. So be it.
2242	Mr. Flores. Okay. I want to oppose the amendment and
2243	request that our colleagues vote against the amendment. FERC
2244	is the lead agency for siting international excuse me,
2245	interstate natural gas pipelines, but there are a number of
2246	other federal and state agencies that must issue permits for
2247	large-scale projects.
2248	And through the FERC prefile process, sponsors engage
2249	with landowners, local communities, and government agencies
2250	to educate stakeholders and collect information about the
2251	best location for siting the pipeline. Unfortunately,
2252	sometimes logjams occurs in the process. For example, under

the Clean Water Act, a special permit is required to cross terrain through wetlands.

However, before the Corps issues their permits, they may require the applicant to survey the area. Sometimes the landowner denies access to the site, leaving the applicant process stuck. So H.R. 2910 specifies that agencies considering an aspect of a FERC application can utilize information gathered by remote aerial surveys with the condition that the data will be verified by subsequent onsite inspections.

Remote aerial surveys are widely accepted. They are a proven method of collecting environmental information.

Allowing remote surveys would improve the environmental review and eliminate potential for unnecessary delays.

Allowing remote surveys would give agencies access to more information. More information leads to better decisions. I don't see how anybody can argue with that.

And just so we are clear, here is the language that the gentleman is proposing to strike. Starting with line 8 on page 11, "Remote surveys. If a federal or state agency considering an aspect of an application for federal authorization requires the person applying for such authorization to submit data, the agency shall consider any

2276	such data gathered by aerial or other remote means that the
2277	person submits. The agency may grant a conditional approval
2278	for the federal authorization based on the data gathered by
2279	aerial or remote means, conditioned upon the verification of
2280	such data by a subsequent onsite inspection."
2281	So we haven t really don't anything except provide for
2282	additional information on a conditional basis, which would be
2283	backed up by subsequent onsite data. So I urge a no vote
2284	because I believe the gentleman's amendment is not needed at
2285	this point.
2286	Thank you.
2287	Mr. Pallone Would the gentleman yield?
2288	Mr. Flores. Sure. I will just yield back, but go
2289	ahead.
2290	Mr. Pallone I am not arguing that you wouldn't have to
2291	have verification on ground eventually. The problem, though
2292	and this is what we face in New Jersey is that there is
2293	no notification of the aerial. And so often times the
2294	property owners - in this case, particularly with the
2295	PennEast Pipeline the survey is done by air, and they
2296	don't know anything about it until very until the very end
2297	of the process, because there is no notification of the
2298	aerial survey.

This is an	unedited	transcript.	The statements	within	may	be
inaccurate	, incomple	ete, or misattı	ributed to the spe	eaker.		

2299	And so, as a consequence, the landowner or the local
2300	government has very little time to actually, you know,
2301	provide any input. That is what we are facing right now.
2302	I thank the gentleman for yielding.
2303	Mr. Flores. Thank you. Reclaiming my time, but, again,
2304	through the FERC prefile process, sponsors engage with the
2305	landowners, local communities, and government agencies to
2306	educate their stakeholders and collect information about the
2307	best location for siting the pipeline. So this doesn't wind
2308	up as a big surprise to most landowners.
2309	I yield back.
2310	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
2311	wishing to speak on the amendments? The gentleman from
2312	Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.
2313	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.
2314	Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of the Pallone
2315	amendment. The bill before us today will allow the use of
2316	survey data collected by aerial or other remote means in the
2317	federal authorization process for natural gas project
2318	application.
2319	My Republican colleagues argue that the use of such data
2320	in lieu of ground surveys would speed up the approval process
2321	for construction of new pipelines. In fact, the use of

This is	an	unedite	d tran	script.	The statements	within	may	be
inaccu	rate,	, incom	olete, o	r misatt	ributed to the sp	eaker.		

2322	aerial data may very well have the opposite effect. Aerial
2323	data would still need to be verified with the survey data
2324	collected onsite.
2325	Pipeline routes may well have to be changed, even after
2326	initial approval, if aerial data cannot be verified. This
2327	could result in lengthy construction delays while wasting
2328	already precious resources in the process. Beyond such
2329	delays, I have other serious reservations about the use of
2330	aerial and other remote surveys in the application and
2331	authorization process.
2332	The use of aerial surveys is bad for the environment.
2333	With aerial surveys, it is difficult to assess the presence
2334	of endangered plants and wildlife. It can also be difficult
2335	to identify certain types of sensitive and protected
2336	ecosystems, like wetlands.
2337	Aerial and remote surveys are also bad for property
2338	owners. Use of such data would effectively strip landowners
2339	as well as the local agencies of their ability to participate
2340	meaningfully in the pipeline siting process. Make no
2341	mistake, Mr. Chairman, approving the use of aerial and survey
2342	data for authorization of new gas projects will only serve to
2343	diminish the rights of property owners.
2344	I am sure we can all agree that natural gas projects

2345	need to be planned, approved, and developed using the best
2346	available data. Data from aerial and remote surveys are
2347	simply too limited and flawed to meet this goal.
2348	I strongly support the amendment to strike this language
2349	from the bill and urge all of my constituents to do the same.
2350	I yield back.
2351	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
2352	wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote
2353	occurs on the amendment offered by the a roll call is
2354	requested. Those in favor of the Rush amendment will vote
2355	aye. Those opposed will vote no.
2356	Mr. Rush. Pallone amendment. Pallone amendment.
2357	The Chairman. I am sorry. The Pallone amendment.
2358	Those in favor of the Pallone amendment, vote aye. Those
2359	opposed, vote no And the clerk will call the roll.
2360	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson.
2361	Mr. Olson. No.
2362	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson votes no.
2363	Mr. Barton.
2364	Mr. Barton. No.
2365	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Barton votes no.
2366	Mr. Shimkus
2367	Mr. Shimkus. No.

		100
2368	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Shimkus votes no.	
2369	Mr. Murphy.	
2370	Mr. Murphy. No.	
2371	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Murphy votes no.	
2372	Mr. Latta.	
2373	Mr. Latta. No.	
2374	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Latta votes no.	
2375	Mr. Harper.	
2376	Mr. Harper. No.	
2377	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Harper votes no.	
2378	Mr. McKinley.	
2379	Mr. McKinley. No.	
2380	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McKinley votes no.	
2381	Mr. Kinzinger.	
2382	[No response.]	
2383	Mr. Griffith.	
2384	Mr. Griffith. No.	
2385	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Griffith votes no.	
2386	Mr. Johnson	
2387	Mr. Johnson No.	
2388	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Johnson votes no.	
2389	Mr. Long.	
2390	[No response.]	

ccurate, mcom	ibiere, or	misatifibuted to	me speaker.	
				109

		100
2391	Mr. Bucshon	
2392	Mr. Bucshon No.	
2393	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Bucshon votes no.	
2394	Mr. Flores.	
2395	Mr. Flores. No.	
2396	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Flores votes no.	
2397	Mr. Mullin.	
2398	Mr. Mullin. No.	
2399	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Mullin votes no.	
2400	Mr. Hudson.	
2401	Mr. Hudson. No.	
2402	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Hudson votes no.	
2403	Mr. Cramer.	
2404	Mr. Cramer. No.	
2405	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Cramer votes no.	
2406	Mr. Walberg	
2407	Mr. Walberg No.	
2408	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walberg votes no.	
2409	Mr. Walden.	
2410	Mr. Walden. No.	
2411	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walden votes no.	
2412	Mr. Rush.	
2413	Mr. Rush. Aye.	

110 2414 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Rush votes aye. 2415 Mr. McNernev. 2416 Mr. McNerney. Aye. 2417 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. McNerney votes aye. 2418 Mr. Peters. 2419 Mr. Peters. Aye. 2420 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. Peters votes aye. 2421 Mr. Green. 2422 Mr. Green. Aye. 2423 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Green votes aye. 2424 Mr. Doyle. 2425 Mr. Doyle. Yes. 2426 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Doyle votes aye. 2427 Ms. Castor. 2428 Ms. Castor. Aye. 2429 Ms. Giannandeli. Ms. Castor votes aye. 2430 Mr. Sarbanes. 2431 Mr. Sarbanes. Aye. 2432 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. Sarbanes votes aye. 2433 Mr. Welch. 2434 Mr. Welch. Aye. 2435 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Welch votes aye. 2436 Mr. Tonko.

		111
2437	Mr. Tonko. Aye.	
2438	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Tonko votes aye.	
2439	Mr. Loebsack.	
2440	Mr. Loebsack. Aye.	
2441	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Loebsack votes aye.	
2442	Mr. Schrader.	
2443	Mr. Schrader. Aye.	
2444	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Schrader votes aye.	
2445	Mr. Kennedy	
2446	Mr. Kennedy. Aye.	
2447	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Kennedy votes aye.	
2448	Mr. Butterfield.	
2449	Mr. Butterfield. Aye.	
2450	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Butterfield votes aye.	
2451	Mr. Pallone	
2452	Mr. Pallone Aye.	
2453	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Pallone votes aye.	
2454	Chairman Upton.	
2455	The Chairman. Votes no.	
2456	Ms. Giannangeli. Chairman Upton votes no.	
2457	The Chairman. Members wishing to change their vote or	
2458	cast a vote? Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.	
2459	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there wer	ce

2460	14 ayes and 17 noes.
2461	The Chairman. 14 ayes, 17 noes. The amendment offered
2462	by the gentleman from New Jersey is not accepted.
2463	Are there further amendments to the bill? The
2464	gentlelady from Florida has an amendment.
2465	Ms. Castor. I have an amendment at the desk, D-04,
2466	called Avoiding Wasteful Government Spending.
2467	[The amendment offered by Ms. Castor follows:]
2468	*********COMMITTEE INSERT 6******

This is an	unedited transcript.	The statements	within	may	be
inaccurate	e, incomplete, or misatt	tributed to the spe	eaker.		

2469	The Chairman. The clerk will report the title of the
2470	bill.
2471	Ms. Giannangeli. Amendment to H.R. 2910, offered by Ms.
2472	Castor.
2473	The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as
2474	read. The staff will distribute the amendment, and the
2475	gentlelady is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her
2476	amendment.
2477	Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members, the bill
2478	before us today aims to expedite the Federal Energy
2479	Regulatory Commission review of natural gas pipeline
2480	applications. Now, despite the fact that 90 percent of FERC
2481	natural gas pipe ine projects are approved within 1 year, I
2482	do understand the desire for FERC and other agencies to be as
2483	efficient as possible.
2484	And I am not the only one that feels this way. Earlier
2485	this month the White House set up a new council to help
2486	project managers navigate the bureaucratic maze, saying that
2487	their council will also improve transparency by creating a
2488	new online dashboard, allowing everyone to easily track major
2489	projects through every state of the approval process.
2490	Now, I have raised this issue before, that this bill is
2491	redundant and unnecessary, because I am sure all members

recall that in 2015, in the overwhelmingly bipartisan FAST

Act that was signed into law, the Congress directed the executive branch to set up the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council, or we call it FPISC, to improve timeliness, predictability, and transparency of federal environmental review and authorization process for major infrastructure projects, including interstate natural gas pipelines.

The council is now getting organized. It will oversee permitting for over 30 major infrastructure projects that will all benefit from enhanced coordination, including establishment of a lead agency for the project, recommended performance schedules, and public project timelines, and greater transparency at all levels of review.

It turns out that the White House pronouncement and the FPISC are the exact same council. And taking all of that into account, the bill before us is unnecessary and redundant. Increased coordination and transparency for infrastructure permitting is already covered by FPISC, so let's not add another layer here by adopting this bill.

The committee would have benefitted from testimony from FPISC on any possible redundancies with H.R. 2910. However, the majority did not invite FPISC to testify on this bill, despite requests to hold additional hearings so members could

2515	hear about their progress so far.
2516	So to eliminate this wasteful duplication, my amendment
2517	requires OMB to determine that the bill does not duplicate
2518	any existing federal efforts to improve the timeliness,
2519	predictability, and transparency of the federal environmental
2520	review and authorization process, and doesn't result in
2521	wasteful government spending.
2522	This is just an exercise in good government. If my
2523	Republican colleagues won't solicit input from federal
2524	agencies while drafting legislation, then taxpayers should
2525	not have to pay for their mistakes. If the provisions of
2526	this bill are unique, then the Act will go forward as is.
2527	But if OMB finds that these transparency and streamlining
2528	functions are already being done elsewhere, then the
2529	unnecessary and wasteful bill will not go into effect.
2530	So let's not set up a duplicative process with this
2531	bill. I urge my colleagues to adopt my common-sense
2532	amendment and yield back my time.
2533	The Chairman. The gentlelady yields
2534	Ms. Castor. I will yield to Mr. Peters.
2535	Mr. Peters. I would like to thank the gentlelady. I
2536	just want to express some frustration. I will support this
2537	amendment, but I actually am someone who is interested in

This is an	unedited transcript.	The statements	within	may	be
inaccurate	e, incomplete, or misatt	tributed to the spe	eaker.		

2538	dealing with the regulatory burden of duplicative
2539	environmental review. I actually practiced law in this
2540	field. I think there is a lot of room for improvement. I
2541	think we can still achieve the same high environmental
2542	standards.
2543	But the frustrating thing for me is that this bill only
2544	had the legis ative language was only released to us
2545	Tuesday night. didn't see it until this morning. I am
2546	more than willing to sit down with anyone and talk about how
2547	we could improve it, but Ms. Castor raises a good question
2548	about whether this is already taken care of.
2549	And I would like to have a conversation about, even on
2550	pipelines, which I am you know, there is no particular
2551	pipeline business in my district like there is in Mr. Green's
2552	I think we owe it to the economy to streamline these to
2553	the extent we can.
2554	I just feel like they have been really cut out of that
2555	process here. There is a real discussion to be had here, and
2556	the process that we have had here, the late this late
2557	notice and last-minute changes, this is much different from
2558	what we saw before. It really prevents that kind of
2559	discussion.
2560	So I am going to vote with Ms. Castor on this amendment.

117 2561 I will vote against this bill, but I wanted to signal 2562 explicitly to my colleagues that I am willing to work on this 2563 in a serious way if you are interested. 2564 And I yield back. 2565 The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back her time. 2566 gentleman from Texas, Mr. Flores. 2567 Mr. Flores. | Move to strike the last word. Chairman, the amendment is really what is unnecessary. If we 2568 2569 look at the Energy Policy Act of 2005, or I will just call it the EP Act, FERC has designated as the lead agency for 2570 2571 coordinating necessary environmental reviews and associated 2572 federal authorizations. 2573 As the lead agency, FERC often coordinates with a 2574 variety of federal, state, and local governments, and Indian tribes to balance a wide range -- wide-ranging set of issues, 2575 2576 including potential impacts on environmental and wildlife resources, land use, and property rights. That is what is 2577 under the EP Act 2578 2579 Unfortunately, the way that things have been 2580 implemented, and despite the increased authority that was given to FERC under the EP Act, there is growing evidence 2581 that pipeline in trastructure approvals are being 2582

unnecessarily delayed due to a lack of coordination or

2584	insufficient action among the agencies coordinating the
2585	permitting process.
2586	There is a December 2012 study that found that since the
2587	enactment of the EP Act's permitting reforms, the occurrence
2588	of federal authorization delays exceeding 90 days has risen
2589	from 8 percent to 28 percent, while delays exceeding 180 days
2590	have risen from 3 percent to 20 percent. So that is the
2591	reason for the bill that we have in front of us today.
2592	The overwhelming majority of Americans support expanding
2593	infrastructure to ensure stable, affordable supplies of
2594	energy. Having sufficient supplies of natural gas is
2595	important to keeping electricity and home heating affordable
2596	and reliable, and infrastructure is a smart investment for
2597	energy security, job growth, and manufacturing.
2598	This amendment would jeopardize those investments, and
2599	the jobs that come with it, so I urge a no vote on the
2600	amendment and a ves vote on the underlying bill.
2601	And I yield back.
2602	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other
2603	members? The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5
2604	minutes.
2605	Mr. Pallone Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to
2606	keep arguing this because I know we are almost at the end of

the markup, and actually getting done sooner than I thought we would be.

But, you know, I just don't understand how, you know, when we know that -- and it has been said many times that nearly 90 percent of pipeline projects are approved in less than a year -- why there is any, you know, notion out there that there is going to be -- that there are significant delays.

And it -- you know, we are basically saying on our side that, you know, we want to make sure that there is proper review, and, in this case, that the bill has a critical flaw because it seems that it is largely duplicative of the streamlining provision included in the FAST Act, which was passed on a bipartisan basis last Congress.

The FAST Act authorized the Federal Permitting

Improvement Steering Council to improve the timeliness,

predictability, and transparency of the federal environmental

review and authorization process for major infrastructure

projects, including natural gas pipelines. The council is

overseeing permitting for 32 major infrastructure projects,

including 7 interstate natural gas pipeline projects, and

that process sets up enhanced coordination by establishing a

lead agency for the project, recommended performance

2630	schedules, and public project timetables, and increased
2631	transparency throughout the review process.
2632	And when we have a legislative hearing on a
2633	substantially different form of this bill, FERC testified
2634	that a number of provisions in the bill will duplicate
2635	efforts of the council. I just can't I have to believe
2636	that this bill is just is not only a solution in search of
2637	a problem; it is a solution to non-existent problem that was
2638	already solved by the FAST Act.
2639	And so I encourage all of my colleagues to support this
2640	amendment, so that we can get a determination as to whether
2641	this bill is truly duplicative of other federal efforts. And
2642	I expect that it is, so I would urge a vote in support of the
2643	Castor amendment
2644	I yield back.
2645	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
2646	wishing to speak on the bill? Seeing on the amendment?
2647	Seeing none, the vote occurs on the a roll call vote is
2648	requested. Those in favor of the Castor amendment will vote
2649	aye. Those opposed will vote no. And the clerk will call
2650	the roll.
2651	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson.
2652	Mr. Olson. No.

11140	meompiete, or insattributed to the speaker.	121
2653	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson votes no.	
2654	Mr. Barton.	
2655	Mr. Barton. No.	
2656	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Barton votes no.	
2657	Mr. Shimkus	
2658	Mr. Shimkus No.	
2659	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Shimkus votes no.	
2660	Mr. Murphy.	
2661	Mr. Murphy. No.	
2662	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Murphy votes no.	
2663	Mr. Latta.	
2664	Mr. Latta. No.	
2665	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Latta votes no.	
2666	Mr. Harper.	
2667	[No response.]	
2668	Mr. McKinley.	
2669	Mr. McKinley. No.	
2670	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McKinley votes no.	
2671	Mr. Kinzinger.	
2672	[No response.]	
2673	Mr. Griffith.	
2674	Mr. Griffith. No.	
2675	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Griffith votes no.	

122 2676 Mr. Johnson 2677 Mr. Johnson. No. 2678 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. Johnson votes no. 2679 Mr. Long. [No response.] 2680 2681 Mr. Bucshon 2682 Mr. Bucshon. No. 2683 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. Bucshon votes no. 2684 Mr. Flores. 2685 Mr. Flores. No. 2686 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Flores votes no. 2687 Mr. Mullin. 2688 Mr. Mullin. No. 2689 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Mullin votes no. 2690 Mr. Hudson. 2691 Mr. Hudson. No. 2692 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Hudson votes no. 2693 Mr. Cramer. 2694 Mr. Cramer. No. 2695 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. Cramer votes no. 2696 Mr. Walberg 2697 Mr. Walberg. No.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walberg votes no.

2699	Mr. Walden.
2700	Mr. Walden. No.
2701	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walden votes no.
2702	Mr. Rush.
2703	Mr. Rush. Aye.
2704	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Rush votes aye.
2705	Mr. McNerney.
2706	Mr. McNerney. Aye.
2707	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McNerney votes aye.
2708	Mr. Peters.
2709	Mr. Peters. Aye.
2710	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Peters votes aye.
2711	Mr. Green.
2712	Mr. Green. No.
2713	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Green votes no.
2714	Mr. Doyle.
2715	Mr. Doyle. Yes.
2716	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Doyle votes aye.
2717	Ms. Castor.
2718	Ms. Castor. Aye.
2719	Ms. Giannangeli. Ms. Castor votes aye.
2720	Mr. Sarbanes.
2721	Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.

2722 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. Sarbanes votes aye. 2723 Mr. Welch. 2724 Mr. Welch. Aye. 2725 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Welch votes aye. 2726 Mr. Tonko. 2727 Mr. Tonko. Aye. 2728 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Tonko votes aye. 2729 Mr. Loebsack. 2730 Mr. Loebsack. Aye. 2731 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Loebsack votes aye. 2732 Mr. Schrader. 2733 Mr. Schrader. Aye. 2734 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Schrader votes aye. 2735 Mr. Kennedy 2736 Mr. Kennedy Aye. 2737 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. Kennedy votes aye. Mr. Butterfield. 2738 2739 Mr. Butterfield. Aye. 2740 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Butterfield votes aye. 2741 Mr. Pallone 2742 Mr. Pallone. Aye. 2743 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. Pallone votes aye. 2744 Chairman Upton.

2745	The Chairman. Votes no.
2746	Ms. Giannangeli. Chairman Upton votes no.
2747	The Chairman. Members wishing to change their vote or
2748	cast a vote? Mr Harper, I was
2749	Mr. Harper. Votes no.
2750	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Harper votes no.
2751	The Chairman. Other members? Seeing none, the clerk
2752	will report the tally.
2753	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there were
2754	13 ayes and 18 noes.
2755	The Chairman. 13 ayes, 18 noes. The amendment is not
2756	agreed to.
2757	Are there further amendments to the bill? Seeing none,
2758	the vote occurs on the question occurs on forwarding
2759	H.R. 2910 to the full committee. All those in favor a
2760	roll call vote is requested. The clerk will call the roll.
2761	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson.
2762	Mr. Olson. Aye.
2763	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Olson votes aye.
2764	Mr. Barton.
2765	Mr. Barton. Aye.
2766	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Barton votes aye.
2767	Mr. Shimkus

2768 Mr. Shimkus Aye. 2769 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. Shimkus votes aye. 2770 Mr. Murphy. 2771 [No response.] 2772 Mr. Latta. 2773 Mr. Latta. Aye. 2774 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Latta votes aye. 2775 Mr. Harper. 2776 Mr. Harper. Aye. 2777 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Harper votes aye. Mr. McKinley. 2778 2779 Mr. McKinley. Aye. 2780 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McKinley votes aye. 2781 Mr. Kinzinger. 2782 [No response.] 2783 Mr. Griffith. Mr. Griffith. Aye. 2784 2785 Ms. Giannandeli. Mr. Griffith votes aye. 2786 Mr. Johnson 2787 Mr. Johnson Aye. 2788 Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Johnson votes aye. 2789 Mr. Long. 2790 [No response.]

2791	Mr. Bucshon
2792	Mr. Bucshon Aye.
2793	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Bucshon votes aye.
2794	Mr. Flores.
2795	Mr. Flores. Aye.
2796	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Flores votes aye.
2797	Mr. Mullin.
2798	Mr. Mullin. Aye.
2799	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Mullin votes aye.
2800	Mr. Hudson.
2801	Mr. Hudson. Aye.
2802	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Hudson votes aye.
2803	Mr. Cramer.
2804	Mr. Cramer. Aye.
2805	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Cramer votes aye.
2806	Mr. Walberg
2807	Mr. Walberg Aye.
2808	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walberg votes aye.
2809	Mr. Walden.
2810	Mr. Walden. No. Aye.
2811	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Walden votes aye.
2812	Mr. Rush.
2813	Mr. Rush. No.

	maccarate, incomplete, or impattibuted to the speaker.	128
2814	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Rush votes no.	
2815	Mr. McNerney.	
2816	Mr. McNerney. No.	
2817	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. McNerney votes no.	
2818	Mr. Peters.	
2819	Mr. Peters. No.	
2820	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Peters votes no.	
2821	Mr. Green.	
2822	Mr. Green. No.	
2823	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Green votes no.	
2824	Mr. Doyle.	
2825	Mr. Doyle. No.	
2826	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Doyle votes no.	
2827	Ms. Castor.	
2828	Ms. Castor. No.	
2829	Ms. Giannangeli. Ms. Castor votes no.	
2830	Mr. Sarbanes.	
2831	Mr. Sarbanes. No.	
2832	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Sarbanes votes no.	
2833	Mr. Welch.	
2834	Mr. Welch. No.	
2835	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Welch votes no.	
2836	Mr. Tonko.	

		127
2837	Mr. Tonko. No.	
2838	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Tonko votes no.	
2839	Mr. Loebsack.	
2840	Mr. Loebsack. No.	
2841	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Loebsack votes no.	
2842	Mr. Schrader.	
2843	Mr. Schrader. No.	
2844	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Schrader votes no.	
2845	Mr. Kennedy.	
2846	Mr. Kennedy. No.	
2847	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Kennedy votes no.	
2848	Mr. Butterfield.	
2849	Mr. Butterfield. No.	
2850	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Butterfield votes no.	
2851	Mr. Pallone	
2852	Mr. Pallone. No.	
2853	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Pallone votes no.	
2854	Chairman Upton.	
2855	The Chairman. Votes aye.	
2856	Ms. Giannangeli. Chairman Upton votes aye.	
2857	The Chairman. Other members wishing to how is Mr.	
2858	Murphy recorded?	
2859	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Murphy is not recorded.	

2860	Mr. Murphy. Votes aye.
2861	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Murphy votes aye.
2862	The Chairman. Other members wishing to change their
2863	vote or cast a vote? Seeing none, the vote the clerk will
2864	report the tally.
2865	Ms. Giannangeli. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there were
2866	17 ayes and 14 noes.
2867	The Chairman. 17 ayes, 14 noes. The question on
2868	forwarding the bill to the full committee is approved. And,
2869	without objection, the staff is authorized to make technical
2870	and conforming changes to the legislation approved by the
2871	subcommittee today. So ordered.
2872	Without objection, the subcommittee stands adjourned.
2873	Thank you.
2874	[Whereupon, at 12:14 p.m., the subcommittee was
2875	adjourned.]